

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. VII

Summer Number, 1938

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	CHARLES K. GILBERT	JOHN W. LANGDALE
LUCIUS H. BUGBEE	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
FREDERICK K. STAMM	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN	

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb	Carl Sumner Knopf	Halford E. Luccock
Edgar Sheffield Brightman	Edward H. Kraus	Harris Franklin Rall
Clarence Tucker Craig	Umphrey Lee	Richard Roberts
Albert Edward Day	Edwin Lewis	Wilbourn E. Saunders
Wilbert F. Howard	McIllyar H. Lichliter	Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Faith in Christ.....	Eugene W. Lyman 323
The Condition of Religion in the United States...Kenneth Scott Latourette	335
World Council as Achievement and as Prophecy....William Adams Brown	346
The Christian Doctrine of Government.....Russell Henry Stafford	357
The Ethical Supremacy of Jesus.....John Wright Buckham	368
The Problem of Pain and the Doctrine of Immortality.....John Paterson	374
Prayer.....A. Maude Royden	385
The Preacher: A Creative Theologian.....Edwin E. Aubrey	392
Nicholas Berdyaev.....Paul Tillich	407
Stained Glass.....James Sheldon	416
Improving Our Hymns.....J. V. Moldenhawer	427
Bible Words as Book Titles.....Robert B. Pattison	439
The Church and the World.....R. Birch Hoyle	451
Two Important Books of Theology.....D. C. Macintosh	456
Book Reviews.....	462
Bookish Brevities.....	479

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1922, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the July, 1938, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Published by
THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

EDWIN E. AUBREY, Ph.D. Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D. President of the Universal Council for Life and Work; Member of the Provisional Committee for the World Council of Churches. Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM, Ph.D., D.D. Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.

R. BIRCH HOYLE, A.T.S. Theological Reviewer for the *British Weekly*, Free Church Chaplain for the Borough of Lambeth, London.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, Ph.D., D.D. D. Willis James Professor of Missions and Oriental History in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

EUGENE W. LYMAN, D.D., S.T.D. Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D. Dwight Professor of Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Divinity School, Yale University. Chairman of the Department of Religion, Graduate School.

J. V. MOLDENHAWER, D.D. Minister of The First Presbyterian Church, New York City.

JOHN PATERSON, Ph.D. Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew University, Madison, N. J.

ROBERT B. PATTISON, B.D. A minister of the Baptist Church; Contributor to various religious magazines. Briarcliff Manor, N. Y.

A. MAUDE ROYDEN, D.D. Former minister of City Temple, London. Internationally known lecturer and author. Nestlewood, Bayley's Hill, Sevenoaks, Kent.

JAMES SHELDON. Banker, New York City. Member of Washington Cathedral's Fine Arts Committee, Building Committee, and Great Council.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD, D.D., LL.D. Minister of the Old South Church in Boston.

PAUL TILlich. Visiting Professor at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Copyright, 1938, by The Abingdon Press, Inc. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Faith in Christ

EUGENE W. LYMAN

THE distress of our times, and doubtless also a sense of personal need, summon interpreters of the Christian gospel to a new and profounder understanding of the meaning of faith in Christ. But theological thought is divided today as to the direction in which we should look for this deeper understanding.

The Crisis-Theology affirms that faith in Christ is bound up with the doctrine of the Incarnation as a super-historical deed of God. This position it definitely contrasts with the historical effort to know the religion of Jesus as being that which supplies the indispensable content for our faith in Him as Lord and Christ. Some of the representatives of this school affirm that nothing like a religion of Jesus is derivable from the New Testament at all.

The assumption of modern theology, on the other hand, has been that to know the historical Jesus is the necessary basis for faith in Him as Lord and Christ, or for any doctrine of the Incarnation. This assumption has meant that it is the historical Jesus that the man of humble faith knows, and that the knowledge gained through scholarship could only strengthen such faith, if the scholars were in turn men of humble faith themselves. This position implies, further, that faith and historical knowledge are in some kind of reciprocal relation, since Christianity affirms an historical revelation.

The Crisis-Theology, for its part, has been deeply concerned to bring the modern Christian back to the thought-world of the Bible as a whole, and especially to Paul and to the meaning of faith in Christ as taught by him.

In the light of the issue thus drawn the question of the meaning of faith in Christ has two aspects, namely, What is the essence of Paul's Christianity? and secondly, Do the Synoptic Gospels, which of course come from the early Christian community, enable us to know the religion of Jesus, and if so, what is its essential character? Let us take up these two subdivisions of our main question in the order mentioned. What, then, we have first to ask, is the essence of the Christianity of Paul?

Barth "pulled the church-tower bell," as has been said, with his commentary on Romans, which was first published in 1918 and which was first translated into English, from the sixth edition, in 1933. In this commen-

tary Barth makes a sharp contrast between Jesus as an historical personality and the eternal Christ, and he derives the whole meaning of Paul's Christianity from the latter conception. Commenting on the phrase, "Declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (Romans 1. 4), Barth says: "This declaration of the Son of man to be the Son of God is the significance of Jesus, and, apart from this, Jesus has no more significance or insignificance than may be attached to any man or thing or period of history in itself." (*The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 30.) "As Christ," Barth writes, "Jesus is the plane which lies beyond our comprehension. The plane which is known to us, He intersects vertically, from above. Within history, Jesus as the Christ can be understood only as Problem or Myth." (Op. cit. pp. 29-30.) And again, commenting on the passage, "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Romans 8. 3), Barth writes:

"Because God is eternal and omnipotent, He is unique and once-for-all. To this, Jesus, the Christ, the eternal Christ, bears witness. At these crossroads, then, God's own Son stands, and He stands nowhere else. GOD SENDS HIM—from the realm of the eternal, unfallen, unknown world of the Beginning and the End. Therefore—but let no orthodox person rejoice—He is 'begotten not made'—that is, He is contrasted with every creature familiar to us. Therefore, He is 'born of the Virgin Mary'—that is, He is our protest against assigning eternity to any Humanity or Nature or History which we can observe. Therefore, He is 'very God and very Man'—that is, He is the document by which the original, lost-but-recoverable union of God and man is guaranteed. GOD SENDS HIM—into this temporal, fallen world with which we are only too familiar; into the order which we can finally interpret only in biological categories, and which we call 'Nature'; into this order which we can finally interpret only from the point of view of economic materialism, and which we call 'History'; . . . GOD SENDS HIM—not to change this world of ours, not for the inauguration of a moral reformation of the flesh, not to transform it by art, or to rationalize it by science, or to transcend it by the *Fata Morgana* of religion, but to announce the resurrection of the flesh; to proclaim the new man who recognizes himself in God." (*Ibid.*, p. 277.)

From passages like these it is plain that Barth does not find the essence of Paul's Christianity in the significance of Jesus as an historical personality; but rather, he finds it in the acknowledgment of Jesus to be the eternal Word, the pre-existent Logos. It is for this reason that he compares Jesus to a document which guarantees the truth of salvation. It is for the same reason that Jesus, in respect to His earthly life, is repeatedly spoken of by both Barth and Brunner as "The Great Incognito." Concerning the phrase, "condemned sin in the flesh," Barth writes:

"In order that the condemnation might be perfected, this KENOSIS of the Son of God, this *form of a servant*, this impenetrable incognito, is not accidental but essential." (*Ibid.*, p. 281.)

And in another connection he says:

"The revelation which is in Jesus, because it is the revelation of the righteousness of God, must be the most complete veiling of His incomprehensibility. In Jesus, God becomes veritably a secret: He is made known as the Unknown, speaking in eternal silence." (*Ibid.*, p. 98.)

But is this complete subordination of the Jesus of history to the doctrine of the eternal Logos, so that the human Jesus is a Great Incognito and not a revelation of God, the essential and creative thing in Paul's Christianity?

It is a striking fact that one of the greatest works on Paul by an American scholar takes the precisely opposite view. There is no more important work on Pauline Christianity than the book by F. C. Porter of Yale, *The Mind of Christ in Paul*. Porter holds that the only adequate explanation of the Christianity of Paul is Jesus Himself, the Jesus of history. The basic Christian profession, he points out, is one that comes in the directest way from Jesus in the Aramaic word, Abba, Father; and in the religion of Fatherhood is involved a religion of Sonship. Moreover, this religion of Sonship, instead of carrying with it a radical separation of Christ from the Christian, through Christ's having a metaphysical nature totally different from that of other men, opens the way to the profoundest spiritual union with Christ. As Paul writes in the Galatian letter:

For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. . . . And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God. (Galatians 3. 26; 4. 6, 7.)

Central for all Porter's thought of Paul's Christianity is the Pauline saying, "We have the mind of Christ." And when we ask what this means to Paul, we are to find the answer in the great hymn of love in the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians, and in all the self-sacrificing love of Paul's own life. So Porter writes:

"Paul understands this religion of Jesus in its double aspect of grace and severity. He does not substitute the aspect of grace for that of endeavor and achievement. He understands that God's work in us, and our work in and with God stand side by side, both belonging to the nature of love. 'Work out your own salvation, for it is God that works in you.' 'If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also Walk.'" (*Op. cit.*, p. 89.)

When Porter turns to the names and titles applied to Jesus in the Pauline epistles—Messiah, Son of God, Spirit, Lord—he points out the great difference between interpreting Jesus by the titles and interpreting the titles by Jesus Himself. It is always the latter, he finds, which is taking place in the consciousness of Paul. This is obviously true in the case of the title Messiah or Christ. The word "Christ" in the epistles has become a part of the proper name of Jesus, so that its meaning is controlled much more by what Jesus was than by the history of the term. But the same is true of the other titles—Son of God, Spirit, Lord. These all have their historic content, but the controlling thing with Paul is the new content put into them by Jesus Himself. And the unique thing about this new content is that, exalted as these terms are, they are so made over by the character of Jesus that they express the most profound and intimate relation between Him and the Christian. "But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit." (2 Corinthians 3. 18.)

But can the same be said of the passages in Paul's epistles in which Christ seems to be identified with the pre-existent Logos? Do not these passages involve a separation of Christ from other men in terms of metaphysical being, which is inconsistent with the idea that there is no barrier between Christ's Sonship and that of the Christian? There are three such passages, which, while they do not use the term "Logos," plainly involve that doctrine. They are 1 Corinthians 8. 6; Philippians 2. 5-11; Colossians 1. 5-11. Porter does find these passages to be incompatible with the conception that Christ's sonship is to be shared—that He is "the first-born among many brethren"; but he considers that none of the three is directly from Paul himself. The Corinthian passage he takes to be a bit of a Stoic creed which Paul quotes from the inquiries which the Corinthian church has sent to him. The Philippian passage he regards as a poem by another which Paul borrows, as a minister borrows poetry for his sermon. And the Colossian passage he finds to be most probably a later interpolation.

We cannot go into the arguments on which this treatment of the passages in question rests. They are strong enough so that they cannot be easily disregarded, and Porter does not stand alone among New Testament scholars in his views upon the matter. On the other hand the burden of proof rests upon the position that these passages are not directly from Paul. This is perhaps a case where those who are not experts in the field of New

Testament criticism should suspend judgment. But such a suspension of judgment does not, to my thinking, seriously impair the strength of Porter's demonstration that the religion of Paul is the religion of Jesus, and that all which he says about Jesus should be interpreted, not as raising a barrier between Christ and the Christian, but as opening the way to the fullest union between them. After all, not everything in Paul can be retained as having positive and permanent meaning for Christian faith, and perhaps we should not try to make Paul too consistent in all his utterances. As Porter says in another connection:

"It is not easy to adjust Paul's doctrine of election to his doctrine of the love of God. Paul does not make them harmonious, but he does give love the first place in the nature of God, and the final place in His purposes." (*Ibid.*, p. 128.)

But as between the Barthian view that the basic and essential thing in Paul's Christianity is the identification of Jesus with the pre-existent Logos, with its consequent treatment of the historic Jesus as The Great Incognito, and the view of Porter which we have just considered, it should not be difficult to decide. The latter is the more historical and the profounder view. Let me sum it up in Porter's words:

"These two things then Paul knows: Jesus Himself, the Jesus of history, the fact of Jesus; and Jesus in the mind of the Christian, the experience that when one not only sees Jesus as He was, but sees His divine beauty and supreme excellency, adding wonder to knowledge, the nature of Jesus imparts itself to men, and the Christian comes to be in Christ, and Christ in him." (*Ibid.*, p. 91.)

Our consideration of the essence of Paul's Christianity, then, supports the view that the creative origin of Christianity is the religion of Jesus Himself, and that all doctrine about Jesus must be subject to the test of whether or not it mediates that experience to the Christian.

But we have already noted that there is a second aspect to our inquiry, namely, Do the Synoptic Gospels enable us to know the religion of Jesus? In general this question arises from the obvious fact that Jesus did not write the Gospels, or any part of them, but that they originated among His followers after His death. The problem thus immediately arises: Are the Synoptic Gospels dominated by a Christology, and if so, is this Christology the key to Jesus' own self-consciousness?

An important book, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, who is also the translator of Barth's *Romans*, presents the problem in a challenging way. Hoskyns finds the Synoptic Gospels to be con-

trolled by one single Christology, the Messiahship of Jesus who is consciously fulfilling Old Testament prophecy and who, as the consummation of the purpose of the Living God, is the supreme divine Event in history. Throughout the Synoptic Gospels, Hoskyns says:

"Jesus is the Messiah who came in humiliation, and who in His humiliation inaugurated the Kingdom of God and fulfilled the Righteousness demanded by the Law and the Prophets. Jesus is also the Messiah who will come in Glory at the end of the present order, and will establish the final Kingdom." (*Op. cit.*, p. 162.)

In accordance with this point of view Hoskyns regards the miracles, to which he apparently gives wholesale acceptance, as signs which are given in order to fulfill Old Testament prophecy. Likewise he treats the death of Christ as the intentional fulfillment of Isaiah 53, and he finds all the eschatological and apocalyptic elements connected with the parables and other sayings of Jesus to be expressions of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus.

What shall we think of this view that the Synoptic Gospels are wholly dominated by a Christology which centers in Jesus' consciousness of Messiahship, which is largely shaped by Old Testament prophecy, and which treats Jesus' earthly life as a humiliation? Clearly in this view Messianic doctrine is the main thing, rather than the religion of Jesus Himself; for though His own Messianic consciousness is central in this view, yet the meaning of Messiahship is that of an official rôle already determined in the Old Testament. Such a view goes far toward canceling Jesus' own living relation to God as the creative origin of Christianity.

But in the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels presented by Hoskyns there are several important historical considerations which are quite ignored. One of them is that in the Old Testament and later Judaism taken together there is no one authoritative meaning for Messiah, but rather a wide range of meanings, extending all the way from the simple figure of an earthly king like David to that of an entirely heavenly being such as is portrayed in the Book of Enoch. And while most scholars agree that Jesus espoused the title Messiah in some sense, it seems clear that He was concerned to put His own meaning into the term rather than to accept any established meaning. In other words, just as He transformed and transcended the Mosaic Law in fulfilling it, so He transformed and transcended the title "Messiah" in adopting it. In fact we have one record of His criticizing and refuting the conception that the Messiah must be the son of David. (Mark 12. 35-37 and parallels.)

A second historical point of importance is that the Synoptic Gospels arose in the midst of apocalyptic hopes which had been intensified tenfold by the experiencing of Jesus' death and resurrection. The consequence of this point is that a magnifying of the eschatological and apocalyptic elements in the traditions concerning Jesus was inevitable, no matter how brief the time of tradition may have been. This point holds good also even though one recognizes, as most historical scholars do, that Jesus' own thought must have had an apocalyptic framework.

A third consideration involves an indispensable principle of historical criticism. This principle is that an adequate historical study of Jesus will be bound to let the stress fall on that which was new and original in Jesus. In other words, it will give the greatest significance to the respects in which He transcended His time rather than to those in which He was a sharer in His time. Only so can we hope to penetrate to the creative origin of Christianity at all. This applies not only to such matters as apocalyptic ideas or the conception of demoniacal possession, but also to all the titles applied to Jesus—whether Messiah, or Son of David, or Son of Man, or Son of God. In regard to all these titles we should employ the method to which Porter leads us concerning the titles used in the Pauline epistles. That is, we should not interpret Jesus by the titles, all of which had a history and had acquired a meaning apart from Him, but rather, we should interpret the titles by Jesus Himself—that is, by Jesus as we know Him through the total portrait of His life and death.

When we speak of the total portrait of Jesus in the Gospels as a norm for judging particular elements of the gospel tradition, we are obviously appealing not only to the biographical data but also to an intuitive appreciation of their meaning. But how can a religious personality—or for the matter of that, any personality of any significance at all—be understood without intuitive appreciation? Intuitive appreciation is called for by the nature of the reality with which we are dealing, and without it we miss the reality itself. Moreover, the principle which we have just brought forward is a relatively objective one—namely, that we find Jesus more truly in those features of His life and deeds in which He transcended His time than in those which He simply shared with His time.

We are thus led back to the religion of Jesus Himself as the creative origin of Christianity. We must look to His own life with God and His consequent life with men, to the way of life with God and men which He

sought to open to others, to what He most vehemently resisted in the religion about Him, to His own ardent hopes and living faith, and to that to which He most joyfully and tragically committed Himself as being the will of God, if we would gain a fresh apprehension of the creative springs of Christian faith.

Thus to go back to the religion of Jesus is a spiritual undertaking to which we are all summoned by the crisis of our times, if not by the most intimate and personal reasons as well. It would not further us in this undertaking, I fear, if I should attempt to present that religion in abstract form here. In fact, an abstract summarizing of the most profoundly creative reality in all the world's religious history is a self-defeating enterprise. But I should like to lead into that spiritual undertaking in which we should all be sharing by bringing out what I believe to be certain vital applications of the religion of Jesus to the task of the Christian today.

And first, *the religion of Jesus grounds a ministry of reconciliation for the Christian in the eternal grace of God.*

This is a strife-torn world. Nationalism is in the ascendancy in world-politics, engendering jealous rivalries and fears between the nations, and launching their debt-ridden governments into a new race of armaments. The class struggle is intense. In Europe violent methods springing out of class conflicts are threatening large areas with a relapse toward barbarism. A further source of conflict is always with us in the form of rivalries of race. In this strife-torn world the Christian is committed by the very nature of his religious experience to a ministry of reconciliation. For the experience of the grace of God as Jesus has made it known is bound up with reconciling activity among men. If one would worship at the altar, let one first be reconciled to one's brother, we are taught in the Sermon on the Mount. But the fundamental passage is:

Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. (Matthew 5. 44, 45.)

Here we see that it is in the very activity of reconciling work among men that one enters into the meaning of sonship to the heavenly Father and of His impartial graciousness. Hence it is that throughout the teaching of Jesus, in the Lord's prayer, in the parable of the two debtors, and elsewhere, the Christian's experience of God's forgiveness and his own forgiveness of

his fellow men are bound up together. Hence also Jesus' conception of His own sonship as involving His becoming the servant of all and His giving of His life as a ransom for many.

Paul, likewise, unites the grace of God revealed in Christ with a ministry of reconciliation for the Christian. "All things," he says, "are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The Christian is to bear a part in the reconciling work of Christ, by which is to be brought to pass a new creation, a new humanity.

Theology has been prone to interpret the grace of God in wholly transcendent terms, lest somehow it should seem to be based on the works and merit of men. This is what Barth does. But our highest knowledge of the grace of God is through the reconciling work of Christ, and if the spirit of Christ is truly in Christian men and women, we must see in their ministry of reconciliation a new manifestation of the grace of God. Secular thought, on the other hand, in its efforts to overcome strife, relies solely on political arrangements and ethical idealism. Thus it misses that union of humility and the sense of inexhaustible power which is so vital for reconciling work, and which springs from the acknowledgment of our utter dependence on the grace of God.

Let us pass to a second application of the religion of Jesus to the Christian's present task. *Jesus' religion grounds the building of a community of love in the creative will of God.* The religion of Jesus is a religion in which the Creator and King of the universe is known as the Divine Father who is seeking to bring all men into sonship to Himself. This means that men become sons through sharing the mind of the Father and so living the life of love that they reach out to draw all men into the one family of God.

In order to realize the force of this point we may well turn first to Paul, since it is in Paul that the universalism of Christianity comes to fullest and most explicit expression, and since we have seen that the essence of Paul's Christianity is the religion of Jesus. Immediately after he writes to the Galatians: "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus," he adds, "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Galatians 3. 26-28.) And Paul thinks of this universal family of God, not in individualistic terms but, as we are feeling the need of doing today, in organic terms. It is to be the body of Christ "fitly framed and knit to-

gether through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part," whence is to result "the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." (Ephesians 4. 16.) Indeed, Paul puts the creation of a new humanity in Christ into the framework of the cosmic creative process. In the eighth chapter of Romans he writes:

For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected unto vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. (Romans 8. 19-21.)

And when we turn directly to the Gospels we find that the New Order which Jesus proclaimed and initiated is at one and the same time something grounded in the eternal will of God and something in which men bear a part as they enter into sonship of God. The kingdom comes where men respond to the righteousness and love of God in repentance, in obedience, in the childlike spirit, in faith. The kingdom of God is such that greatness in it does not come with the exercise of authority but through becoming servants of all. However we may conceive Jesus' own apocalyptic hopes, we are bound to find the content of those hopes in the meaning which He gave to the kingdom of God—to God's Kingship or rule in the present experience of men.

Most of all should we look to His own consciousness of Sonship for His understanding of the will of God. The mission of Jesus, following on His baptism and His temptation, developed in sharpest contrast to the Law and its interpretation by the Pharisees, and found expression in His ministry to the religiously disinherited classes of Galilee and Judea. The common people, the publicans, the tradesmen and artisans who could not keep the ceremonial law and were therefore sinners, the weak and oppressed—all these heard Him gladly. But on the other hand Jesus did not turn to the Zealots, who from time to time fanned the passions of the mob with the belief that the Messianic kingdom involved a revolt from Rome. Instead He showed them a new kind of Messiah, whose nature was lowliness and whose prototype was the Suffering Servant of the Lord. Thus sonship to God and self-sacrificing service of one's fellow men—most of all, the poorest and neediest—are forever bound up together in the Christian way of life.

A third vital contact between Jesus' own religion and the Christian's

•

present task I would define as follows: *The religion of Jesus grounds the loyal and disinterested pursuit of truth in the vision of God.* This characteristic of Jesus' religion appears in His unqualified stress on sincerity, on singleness of mind and of heart, and in His great beatitude—that the pure in heart shall see God.

We are accustomed to think of the pursuit of truth as primarily a matter of the scientific method, originating in the modern period. Or else we think of it as a matter of philosophical criticism and synthesis, which derives from the Greeks. In either case we are apt to conceive of truth-getting as essentially an intellectual affair, and as not directly involving man's moral and religious experience. But the quest of truth which most vitally concerns the Christian's task today has to do with human relations—ethical, social, economic, political—and in this realm the discovery of facts and laws depends in a crucial way on sincerity and disinterestedness. The sin which especially besets the Church, the intellectual classes, and those who in any way belong to privileged groups, is the sin of hypocrisy. Unconscious hypocrisy it largely is, a blindness to injustices which are concealed in the economic and political processes with which the security and privileges of the groups in question are bound up; but hypocrisy is all the more baleful when it is unconscious. Now it was hypocrisy—probably also largely unconscious—among the religiously and socially privileged of His day, the Pharisees, against which Jesus reacted most intensely. He condemned it bitterly, both because of the oppression of the poor and weak which it masked, and because it made the official interpreters of the law of God into blind leaders of the blind. Can we doubt that, if we would pursue truth in human relations, we have a fundamental need of that singlemindedness, that freedom from Mammon-worship, that sincerity, which was at the heart of the religion of Jesus?

But the secret of Jesus in regard to this vital quality was that He apprehended its relation to the vision of God. May we not best express His meaning if we say both that the vision of God comes to the sincere and pure of heart, and also that, as some measure of the vision of God is gained, the heart grows sincerer and more pure?

If this be true, then we are brought to a fourth contact of essential importance between Jesus' religion and the Christian's present task. *The religion of Jesus engenders a worship of God which flowers in humility, in sincerity, and in love.*

Worship is the perennial and distinctive function of religion, and worship is not worship unless it awakens and strengthens the consciousness of God. There needs always to be a mystical quality in worship—a quality which brings the worshiper into some measure of present union with that Reality which he most deeply reveres and which is the Ultimate Source of his being. But the mysticism needed by the Christian who would courageously confront the critical issues of today must be an ethical mysticism, and that is one of the supreme fruits of the religion of Jesus Christ. The ethical monotheism which is the basis and presupposition of all His experience and deeds is expressed in the two great commands:

"Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength;" and

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Into what exalted consciousness Jesus' own obedience to these two commands brought Him is perhaps best indicated by one of the most significant bits of spiritual autobiography from Jesus that the Gospels contain:

I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them to babes; yea, Father, for so it was well pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him. (Matthew 11. 25-27.)

What ethical mysticism means in the Christianity of Paul we know from his profound interpretation of faith in Christ as a living union with Him which has its fruition in the love that never faileth.

It seems unmistakable that a fresh penetration into the creative origin of our religion in Jesus Christ is the sovereign way to nourish such a worship of God as will engender the humility needed for a ministry of reconciliation in our strife-torn world; to produce the sincerity and singlemindedness so absolutely requisite for knowing the truth concerning the complex human relations in the midst of which we stand; and to foster such love as will work creatively—undismayed by the power of evil—toward the building up of the body of Christ and the realization of the kingdom of God.

The Condition of Religion in the United States

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

WHAT is the condition of religion in the United States? If one were to give credence to the utterances from many of our pulpits, he would believe it to be very bad. An atmosphere of pessimism abounds. "In these trying days" is a favorite phrase. We are repeatedly informed that the world is in revolution, that old and familiar institutions are crumbling, that the future of civilization hangs in the balance, and that the Church, belonging to the old order, is not evincing vitality enough to survive the death of the culture with which it is associated.

The prophets of gloom fall, in the main, into four groups. First are those who have no use for the Church and very little for Christianity and who, standing outside of both, seem to take a kind of joy, although dissembled under the guise of dispassionate and objective analysis, in announcing the fatal illness of the Church and its faith. Second are those, clergy and laymen, who cling with affection to the past, view any departure from it with alarm, and, consciously or unconsciously on the defensive, fighting for methods, attitudes, and programs which are being outmoded, attempt to whip up the flagging energies of their constituencies by verbal flagellations and fill the air with their laments over the apostasy of the Church. Third are those who are burdened by the dangers of the time, who believe that the rank and file of the membership of the churches are unaware of them or indifferent to them, and who seek to stab their fellow Christians into alertness and action by telling them both of the perils of the times and what they believe that Christians should do to meet them. Because Christians do not respond quickly enough to their appeals or because they can induce only a minority to adopt their program of reform, they are sincerely convinced that the Church is dead or dying and proclaim the fact to all who will listen. Fourth are those who are deeply troubled by current ills, who do not yet see the way out, and who, groping, proclaim their distress to listening congregations and add to the atmosphere of depression and defeatism.

It must be clear to all who have eyes to see that much ground exists for

pessimism and confusion. It is not merely the Church which is being threatened. Not only in the United States and in the Church but also in every other land and in every range of life the old is passing. This is not a new experience. Since the dawn of recorded human history mankind has been in transition. Even the supposedly pre-twentieth-century changeless China was never long static. However, in our generation the rate of change is being accelerated. Moreover, in the Occident the attitude toward change has altered. In much of the nineteenth century change was generally regarded as progress. Humanity was believed to be moving onward and upward to a better age and to an ideal civilization. That especially was the conviction in much of the United States. Here we were creating a new nation which, we fondly hoped and loudly asserted, was better than anything in the Old World. Those on the westward-moving frontier particularly were so sure that what they were building was so much better than anything which had gone before that they dubbed the longer-settled portions of the land "the effete East." In contrast with this optimism, throughout much of the Occident the dominant note is now one of apprehension and foreboding. The vogue which *The Decline of the West* and many another similar book has had reflects the temper of the times. In the United States the most articulate elements of the population are notably subject to this mood. We believe that we see Europe moving swiftly to its doom and are frantically attempting to keep ourselves as far as possible aloof from the tragedy. We are no longer a young, experimental country. Our institutions have taken form and those who do most of the speaking and writing and seem to represent and mold public opinion feel their security to be dependent upon the continuation of the existing order. Our internal economic and social changes are accompanied with strife and with discomfort and even suffering to many. It is not surprising that the spokesmen for the Church are affected by the general atmosphere of despondency. They would be strangely impervious to their surroundings if they were not. The future is not secure, either for society as a whole or for the Church.

However, those of us who have given much of our time to meditating on human history should be critical of this pessimism. We recall that again and again in the past a large proportion of those who have left written records of their sentiments have bewailed the degeneracy of their times. If the widespread optimism of the last half of the nineteenth century is now regarded with somber cynicism by our intellectuals, it may be that two or

three decades hence the dejection of today will be looked back upon as the jaundiced attitude of those who were suffering from the shell shock of the World War of 1914-1918 and of the alterations which that catastrophe ushered in. Particularly are Christian preachers apt to be sensitive souls, more responsive than most of their contemporaries to the temper of the times.

It is certain that the present despondency about the state of the Church in the United States is very one-sided and either belittles or ignores entirely aspects of the situation which can form the basis for a quite different attitude toward the future. He would be rash who would confidently prophesy—either good or ill. One of the phrases of the New Testament which has again and again been justified by the event is “whether there be prophecies they shall fail.” However, certain facts in the past give a sound basis for hope.

First of all, we need to remind ourselves that in the course of its history Christianity has shown a remarkable ability to survive the death of cultures with which it has been intimately associated and to go on with increased power.

In its first five centuries Christianity won the Graeco-Roman world and became so intimately associated with the Roman Empire that the two seemed almost inseparable. Then came the collapse of Roman rule and Graeco-Roman culture in much of the basin of the Mediterranean. However, instead of sharing the fate of the Roman Empire, Christianity won the barbarians of Northern Europe who had been a major factor in bringing about the catastrophe, and in the formation of the new cultures which arose in Northern Europe exerted a greater influence than it had on the culture of the Roman world.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the structure of medieval life was largely shattered. For a time it looked as though Christianity might share its doom. In the East the Moslem Turk erased the Byzantine Empire which so long had stood as a bulwark of Christendom against Islam. The great stronghold of Christianity became Western Europe. Internally the Church of that area seemed hopelessly corrupt. It became subject to the secular authorities in the rising states of the times—monarchies which in many ways remind one of the Russia, Italy, and Germany of today. Then came revivals—the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Reformation—more widespread and invigorating than any which Christianity had yet known. The faith followed European explorers and settlers and, by a missionary move-

ment so far unparalleled in extent in the history of any religion, was planted in more lands and among more peoples than ever it had been before. In a variety of ways, too, the culture of the Europe of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries bore the impress of Christianity.

Again at the close of the eighteenth century Christianity seemed in a parlous state. Widespread skepticism and indifference, even in many of the leaders of the Church, appeared to threaten the faith. The French Revolution and the Wars of Napoleon shook all Europe and wiped out much of the old regime with which organized Christianity had become closely intertwined.

However, the period of strain was followed again by fresh revivals. Taken as a whole, Christianity was never quite so vigorous as in the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth century. In the Roman Catholic Church a multitude of new orders and sisterhoods attested to unprecedented vitality in that ancient communion. Protestantism displayed more vigor and religious conviction among the rank and file of its membership than it had even in the first flush of its youth. Awakenings of many kinds punctuated the decades—revivals in the United States, the Oxford Movement in England, the Disruption in Scotland with the rise of the Free Church, and many another indication of deep stirrings of the spirit. Many new denominations came into being—and in Protestantism a new denomination, like a new order in the Roman Catholic Church, is usually an indication that an individual or a group has arisen with fresh religious conviction and enthusiasm. New organizations also sprang into existence to meet particular needs—such as the Sunday Schools, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and the student Christian movements. Remarkable as had been the missions of earlier centuries, those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were even more noteworthy. Settlers and immigrants in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and parts of South America were followed and were held to the faith so effectively that they in turn became centers of missionary enthusiasm. The foreign missionary enterprise rose to unprecedented proportions. Never had any set of ideas, religious or secular, been propagated over so wide an area by so many full-time agents supported by the voluntary gifts of so many millions of people. As a result of these efforts, in the vast majority of lands, churches arose, most of which continue to grow proportionately more rapidly

than do the populations in the midst of which they are set. Cultures have been profoundly modified, not only those of Occidental peoples but those of Asia, Africa, and the islands of the Pacific.

In no land has the abounding vigor of the Christianity of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries been more evident than in the United States. In few if any lands, indeed, has it been so great. Those who live in the midst of them and are among their fruits may easily fail to recognize the really remarkable achievements of Christianity in this country. In no other land have the revivals in Protestantism been so marked. Those which ushered in the nineteenth century on the frontier were followed by those associated with the name of Finney. In the latter part of the century came Moody, and his movement spread far beyond the confines of this country. Here in this period more new major denominations have arisen than in any other country. Here the Sunday Schools, the Young Men's and the Young Women's Christian Associations, and the various young people's societies have had their outstanding development. It is from the United States that the most potent impulses came which led to the student Christian movements in other lands and eventually to the World's Student Christian Federation. Here various humanitarian and reform movements of Christian origin have flourished, notably those for temperance, for the emancipation of the Negro, and for peace.

Here what we think of as "home missions" have been phenomenally successful. Not only has the frontier been followed and the immigrant won to the faith, but also, in spite of the tremendous growth in population, the actual proportion of church members has increased. At the beginning of the nineteenth century less than one-fourth of those living in the United States acknowledged a formal church connection. At present approximately one-half have a formal church tie. Nor is there convincing evidence that by and large the increase has been accompanied by a dilution of devotion. Especially notable has been the winning of the Negroes to the Christian faith—a process which has been largely the work of the little more than seven decades since emancipation.

Not only has the proportion of the population having a church connection increased. Christianity in the United States has also displayed sufficient vigor to found and nourish schools and hospitals. Consider the great system of parish schools and of colleges founded by Roman Catholics and built up by the gifts of a constituency, largely in the lower income brackets, which

has also been taxed to support the public schools. Consider, too, the great array of academies, colleges, universities, and theological seminaries created by the sacrifice of Protestant givers. Remember the part that schools founded by various Christian agencies have had in the education of the Negro and in his preparation for a self-respecting place as a free man in American life. Recall the many hospitals witnessing by their names to the place of the Christian Church in their foundation.

Into the warp and woof of American life Christianity has entered as a potent factor, though usually in ways which cannot be measured and often so unobtrusively that it can scarcely be detected. As one significant example it is worth while recalling the fact that the most popular of our patriotic songs, *America*, was written by a theological student and has in it not only religious fervor but also an idealism which is historically sprung of Protestant Christianity.

A distinctive strain of Christianity has come into being in the United States. This is a result partly of the American environment and partly of the fact that in the United States Christianity has had sufficient vitality to adapt itself to its environment. We must not here undertake to describe in detail the characteristics of American Christianity. That would require a separate article, or, better, a book. Some of them, however, can be named, to illustrate the point that they are indicative, among other things, of abounding vigor.

One is the great complexity displayed by organized Christianity in the United States. Never in any other region in Christian history have so many communions and denominations been represented. Many of these are importations from Europe and are a symptom of the multifarious racial and national origins of our population. Others are indigenous. All are indications of vitality—that types of Christianity of foreign origin have had enough life to follow their constituencies to the United States, and that in the United States Christianity has been able to break away from stereotyped forms and develop new varieties.

A second characteristic of Christianity in the United States has been voluntarism and the absence of state support. From the time of Constantine the Church in Europe had normally enjoyed the support of the State. Sometimes this was chiefly a matter of prestige. Usually it entailed legislation in favor of the Church, and often it had given rise to financial subsidies levied through compulsory taxation. Membership in the Church

and citizenship were generally coextensive—except for a few obdurate, chiefly Jews. From this status the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have seen numerous departures, but in many European lands remnants of it survive. In the United States the few commonwealths in which in 1800 an establishment still existed severed the tie with the Church in the first half of the century. Membership in the Church is purely voluntary and financial support is equally unconstrained by law. That, under these circumstances, the Church should have flourished, grown in membership, and added enormously to its equipment is evidence of the remarkable energy of American Christianity and of the deep-seated conviction which underlies it.

A third characteristic is the divorce of American Christianity from its historic roots in Europe and Asia. This, of course, is by no means complete. In all churches in the United States there is some connection, even though tenuous, with the historic stream of Christianity. In some churches, as the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian, it is very strong. However, most of the groups which have set the pace for the religious life of the older American stock tend to ignore the larger part of the development after New Testament times, or at least between the New Testament and the Reformation. This is partly because of the exuberant feeling during much of the nineteenth century that in the United States the human race was making a new beginning and was breaking with the evil traditions of its European past. It is also in part an indication that in Christianity in the United States the creative impulse was so strong that in many of its dominant expressions it did not depend upon the momentum of the past but gave rise to new forms.

A fourth characteristic, closely related to this last, has been the place held in American life by some of the denominations which in Great Britain and especially on the Continent of Europe are in the decided minority. The Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Disciples of Christ, for example, are very much more important than on the other side of the Atlantic. In the case of the first, this arises out of the New England tradition, and in the case of the other three it has its origin chiefly in the place which these denominations had in carrying Christianity to the frontier. All four, together with many another smaller group, are evidence that in the United States of the nineteenth century Christianity, far from being ossified, was sufficiently flexible to adapt itself to new conditions.

A fifth feature of Christianity in the United States has been the emphasis upon action rather than upon philosophically or theologically creative

thought. This does not mean that the leaders of the Church have been unthinking or that their thought has been of an inferior order. It indicates, rather, the direction which their thought has taken. The fact that the United States has been a new and rapidly growing country has meant that the leaders and members of the Church have, perforce, concentrated their attention upon the winning of the land to the Christian faith and upon the building of institutions adapted to the peculiar and rapidly changing conditions presented by the country. Now that the land is growing older and immigration is being drastically restricted, endowments are accumulating and more energy is being devoted to scholarship and to the type of reflection out of which issue philosophies and theologies. However, the tradition of action is still strong. In this activism of American Christianity is another indication of life—life sufficiently virile and adaptable to depart from the traditions of the Old World and to deal with the conditions presented by the New.

A sixth characteristic, although not so distinctive as some would have us believe, is the endeavor of much of American Christianity to bring in a "Christian society." The "social gospel" has roots in Europe and in Galilee and Judea. It is the legitimate offspring of the activist strain in Western Christianity and this in turn can claim to be based upon the New Testament and the Hebrew prophets. However, the American emphasis indicates that in the United States Christians have taken their faith with sufficient seriousness and confidence to dream and to strive for a society in which the ethics of the Gospels shall be dominant. We have had scores of local efforts to bring into existence Christian communities, and never more vocal than today have been the demands from within Church circles that Christians make the economic, political, and social structure of the United States—and of the world—exemplify Christian principles.

The Christianity of the United States has not been content to confine itself within the boundaries of one country. Great and engrossing though its tasks in building a new nation have been, it has reached out to other lands and has taken a leading part in the remarkable nineteenth and twentieth century foreign missionary enterprise. At the outset of the nineteenth century this participation in foreign missions was largely from the contagion of British example. As the century wore on, however, more and more the conviction of the importance and obligation of foreign missions spread among American Christians. By the end of the century the leadership in Protestant

foreign missions was passing into American hands. In the twentieth century Americans have been increasingly prominent in it. It was in the eighteenth eighties that the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions came into being and, spreading from the United States to most of the leading Protestant lands, gave fresh impulse to the foreign missionary movement. It is an American, John R. Mott, who, more than any other one man, has been responsible for the co-ordination of Protestant foreign missions through the International Missionary Council. Approximately half of the financial contributions which undergird Protestant foreign missions are from American givers. Numerically Americans are predominant in the missionary bodies in Japan, Korea, China, the Philippines, Burma, and the Near East, and are important in India and in parts of Africa. American Roman Catholics are rapidly taking an increasingly prominent place in the foreign missionary enterprise of their Church. This foreign missionary activity, although never heartily endorsed by more than a minority of American Christians, has back of it a considerable minority. It would have been impossible if Christianity in the United States were moribund.

Today it may be that we are witnessing a decline in this prodigious energy which has so characterized the Christianity of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is possible that the decay is affecting Christianity in the United States. If so, however, it is a very recent affair. Its seeds may have been present for a long time, but its development did not make itself clearly apparent until after 1914 and, perhaps, considerably later.

If it should be real, the illness is almost certain not to prove fatal, nor is the decrepitude that of old age. A religion which has just been through an era when it has displayed the greatest vigor of its long history is not likely to come to an early death. Nor is that death likely to occur first in the land where, more than in any other in this creative period, Christianity has evinced such remarkable vitality.

It is not even certain that Christianity, or at least Christianity in the United States, is really in a state of decline. Indeed, the complaints to which we are listening may be signs of life. No one can rightly accuse the leadership of the Church of complaisant somnolence. The awareness of problems and the widespread denunciations of existing conditions are the very opposite of smug contentment. Some of the jeremiads are born of defeatism. Others, however, give evidence of a keenness of social conscience and a fineness of religious perception which are an indication that Christianity has not lost

its ancient power to stir dissatisfaction with present attainments. Often those who belabor the Church from within are the precursors of a revival. They may even be leaders in the revival. A Wyclif, a Savonarola, and a Luther were in part indications that something was wrong in the Church. They were also, and most notably, evidence that the Church bears within itself the healing for its own ills, that its prophets are of its own children.

Even now encouraging signs of life are apparent. The fashion in which non-Roman Catholic Christians the world around are drawing together is a new phenomenon in Christian history. The Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences this past summer are indications of a growing consciousness of a common Christian faith and of a most heartening vitality in meeting the current challenges to the Church's message. The recent gathering at Utrecht which drafted a constitution for a proposed World Council of Churches is a further stage in this development. So, too, the 1938 Conference of the International Missionary Council promises to be a great forward step in strengthening the Church the world around and especially on its newer geographic frontiers. It is significant that all these movements are strong in the United States and draw much of their leadership from it. A religion which can thus rise to meet so great a combination of dangers is far from moribund.

Obviously the Church, like civilization in general, is being forced into a new age. Of the characteristics of that new age we need not speak in detail. Analyses are legion and are become wearisome. We need to remind ourselves, however, how different many of the problems are from those with which the church of the United States has been accustomed to deal. From its inception the Church in this country has had to reckon with the frontier. Many of its methods, including its revivalism, arose out of conditions peculiar to a frontier. For nearly a generation the frontier has been a thing of the past. From its earliest days here the Church has had to deal with the immigrant. Holding him to his traditional faith has been one of its most urgent problems. Since 1914 the stream of immigration has dwindled to a mere trickle. For generations the Church in the United States had chiefly to deal with rural, town and small city populations. To-day the country is more and more dominated by big cities and its population is industrialized or caught in the network of a rapidly growing mechanized structure. The automobile, for instance, is only one of the machines which has quite revolutionized rural life. Between the close of the

Napoleonic wars, in 1815, and the outbreak of the War of 1914-1918 the United States was in little danger of being embroiled in world affairs, or at least in a world war. Today we are frantically struggling to keep from being engulfed in a general world catastrophe which, rightly or wrongly, we fear is imminent. The leaders of the Church are endeavoring to help both the nation and the world to save themselves from the threatened destruction. Nineteenth century American Christianity was in a world in which political democracy was held to be the ideal governmental structure. American Protestant Christianity especially prided itself on its adjustment to a democratic society. Indeed, democracy was in large part the child of Protestantism. Today in many sections of Europe democracy is held to be outworn, and in this country many are echoing the accusation. The foreign missionary enterprise of the nineteenth century was geared to a world whose non-European peoples were rapidly being brought into political and economic subservience to the white man. In the main it met the problems of that situation with remarkable though little recognized success. Today the prestige of the white man has been shaken and millions are preparing to throw off his yoke.

It is not strange that the Church in its various branches is finding it difficult to reshape its program to meet the new conditions. That it has suffered no more is an indication that the basic spiritual needs of men persist from age to age and that in every generation the Christian gospel has a message which meets them. Given that message, the Church, we can confidently hope, will adjust its program, as it has so many times in the past, to meet those of the conditions which do change.

The new age is beset with perils—as have been all ages before it. Man's road has always been rough. It is that which has spurred him to endeavor. The roughness of the road together with man's unconquerable spirit have given rise to civilization. It is the Christian faith that accompanying man in his pilgrimage has been the Eternal Spirit who has inspired man to rise above his obstacles, "to turn his stumbling blocks into stepping stones." The Eternal Spirit, so the Christian faith declares, has been uniquely at work through the Christian Church. That faith re-enforced by past experience indicates that He will continue to work through it and that He will not be defeated.

World Council as Achievement and as Prophecy

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

IT will be remembered that the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences, in approving a plan for a World Council of the Churches, appointed a Committee of Fourteen, seven from each Movement, to perfect the plan and submit it to the Churches. In order to secure the widest and most trustworthy counsel, this Committee requested the participating Churches to send delegates to a Consultative Conference, to be held at Utrecht in May of the present year. The purpose of the Conference was twofold: to prepare a draft of a Constitution for the World Council, and to make provision for carrying on the work now being done by the two Movements until such time as the World Council should be established.

In taking this action, the Committee engaged in a venture of faith. What reason was there for believing that delegates from Churches differing as widely as the Eastern Orthodox and the Baptists could agree upon the Constitution of a Council which was to include them all? What ground was there for hoping that in the brief three days allotted to the Conference the many controversial issues to be considered could find a satisfactory solution?

Many and controversial indeed the issues were. There was not only the matter of the name of the Council, of its theological basis, and of its functions and authority. There was the question (always of the keenest interest in ecclesiastical circles) of the basis of representation. Should it be by countries or by denominations, and if the latter, what part should be played by the international denominational bodies, like the Lambeth Conference, the Lutheran World Council, the Alliance of Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, the Baptist World Alliance, and the like? What place should be given to minority Churches; how provide for adequate representation for laymen, and among these for women? Above all how relate the proposed World Council to the other world organizations functioning in the international field (the International Missionary Council, the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, the World Student Christian Federation, the International Y. M. and Y. W. C. A., and so forth)? And how provide

during the intermediate period before the Council was formally constituted for the continuance of the work now being done by the existing organizations of Faith and Order and Life and Work, which the new Council is designed to unify and to supplement?

Yet on all these points a unanimous decision was reached, and this within the time allotted in the schedule. Many questions of detail were left to be adjusted by the provisional committees set up, but so far as I know, no major question of principle was left undecided.

This was not because there was not divergence of view on many points. Indeed there was scarcely one of the points which I have mentioned on which there was not a sincere difference of opinion. Rather was it due to the spirit which the delegates brought to the discussion, their respect for the convictions of those from whom they differed, their sense not only of the grave importance of the crisis that the Church is facing, but of the degree of unity which we have already reached, and of the necessity of giving this unity some adequate visible expression.

The way was prepared for this by the process by which the delegates were selected. While this was official in the sense that the Churches appointing followed the methods most natural and congenial to them, it was democratic. When, as in the United States and Canada, the Churches to be represented were so many that direct appointment was impossible, electoral conferences were called in which duly authorized representatives of the Churches decided whom of their number they would ask to represent them all. Thus in many cases the persons present at Utrecht were there as spokesmen not only for their own Churches but for many absent Churches.

The membership of the Conference, considering its size, was astonishingly representative. Among the 84 persons present 25 countries and 44 different Churches were included. The ecclesiastical distribution was roughly as follows: 5 Orthodox, 8 Anglican and Episcopalian, 15 Presbyterian and Reformed, 7 Lutheran, 6 Methodist, 4 Congregationalist, Baptist and Disciples. Doctor Bond of the Seven Day Baptist Church, and Dean Russell of the Friends, were spokesmen for the smaller Churches of America. The Negro Churches were ably represented by Bishop Greene of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Beside the official delegates a number of representatives of other ecumenical organizations were present for purposes of consultation. Among the bodies thus represented were the International Missionary Council, the

World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, the International Y. M. and Y. W. C. A., the World Student Christian Federation, the International Sunday School Federation, and the Central Bureau of Inter-Church Aid.

There were some unavoidable but none the less regrettable absences. No representative of the German Churches was present. Owing to political conditions the representation from the Orthodox Churches was numerically less than we could have desired. China and India alone among the more distant Churches were represented. Nevertheless the range of interest and viewpoint included were sufficient to give the findings of the Conference widespread significance and authority.

The matters with which the Conference dealt were of three kinds. (1) The preparation of a draft Constitution for the proposed World Council. (2) The definition of its relationship to existing organizations during the period before it should be formally constituted. (3) The provision of Committees, Finance and Staff, to supplement and unify existing agencies for which the immediate support of the Churches concerned was to be asked. The procedure was of the simplest. At its first meeting the Conference was defined as a joint Conference of delegates from the Churches and members of the Committee of Fourteen. The Archbishop of York, Chairman of the Committee of Fourteen, was chosen Chairman of the joint Conference. Two drafting Committees were appointed, one to deal with the matter of the Constitution, the other with that of the provisional organization to be set up. For the most part, however, the Conference sat as a whole, and all questions of principle were decided in plenary sessions. Representatives of visiting organizations participated in the discussions but did not vote.

With a single exception the proceedings were private. There was, however, on Monday a public meeting in the Cathedral presided over by the Archbishop of York, in which representatives of different branches of the Church participated. After this meeting there was a public reception to the delegates in the University.

As the text of the Constitution agreed upon for submission to the Churches, as well as the document providing for ad interim arrangements have already been given to the press, it is not necessary to reproduce them here in detail. It is sufficient to say that they follow in general the lines of the joint report represented to the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh, and approved in principle by them. They provide for a General Assembly

to meet once in five years, for a Central Committee to meet annually, and for permanent Commissions in the field of Life and Work and Faith and Order. They specify also the functions which the World Council is to fulfill, define the nature and limits of its authority, and provide for the continuation of its relationship to other organizations functioning in the ecumenical field.

In view of the great importance of the action taken and its many possible ramifications, it may be of interest to our readers to have a brief account of the questions on which the delegates differed, and how final agreement was reached.

The first of these was the name. There were some who feared that the name Council was too ambitious and might suggest comparison with the ecumenical Councils of the past. There were others, notably those from the Continent and from the United States who felt strongly that the word Council expressed more accurately than any other which it was possible to find, exactly what the proposed World Council was to be, a body of representatives of autonomous Churches meeting steadily for counsel on matters of common interest. They felt further that any change in the name made after invitations had been sent to the Churches, and had been accepted by them, might be misconstrued as if involving some change of purpose. It was finally decided to retain the name World Council chiefly because after diligent search no more satisfactory substitute could be found. It was also pointed out that under the powers conferred upon the Council by the Constitution it would be possible for the Assembly when it meets to make any change in the title which the experience of the intervening period might show to be advisable.

Less difficulty than might have been expected was found in determining the theological basis. All present agreed that whatever might be true of a Conference of individuals, a Conference of Churches must be given a definitely Confessional basis. For this purpose the formula already made familiar by Lausanne, seemed to offer least difficulty. Many delegates would have preferred a warmer and less technical phrase, and the words "God Incarnate and Saviour of the World" were suggested as an acceptable, as well as a more orthodox paraphrase of the term "God and Saviour." It was thought wiser, however, at least until the meeting of the Continuation Committee of Faith and Order in August, which must give final approval to the proposed Constitution before it can be submitted to the Churches, to let the existing language of Faith and Order stand. If the Faith and Order

Committee should itself propose a modification along the lines suggested above, it would, I feel confident, be welcomed by many of those present at Utrecht.

During the discussion of the doctrinal basis letters were read from Unitarian bodies and from the Czecho Slovak Church (a body formed some years ago by secession from Rome) in which they expressed the hope that no formula would be adopted which would make it impossible for them to enter the proposed World Council. In answer it was pointed out that in adopting the doctrinal basis the Council would not pass judgment upon the orthodoxy of any Church, but that it was left to each to determine whether and how far it could honestly come in under the formula. To those Unitarians who have already been associated with the Life and Work Movement, either directly or through affiliated movements like the World Alliance, it was further pointed out that the proposed Constitution leaves the new Council the same liberty of association with Unitarians which is now enjoyed by Life and Work, either (a) through their co-operation on commissions in the field of Christian ethics, (b) through their participation in regional or world conferences to be called in this field, or (c) through membership in other organizations (for example, the World Alliance) with which the World Council may desire to co-operate in the field of common interest.

The question of authority proved a delicate one, but it was found possible to reach general agreement through a definition of function. All agreed that while the Conference must have no authority to bind the Churches or to speak for them in matters in which there is difference of opinion, there must be left to the Council full power to act for the Churches in the field of agreement, and this both on the side of Life and Work and of Faith and Order. This field of agreement on examination proved wider than many of the delegates had realized, and provision was made in the Constitution for its continuance.

In general the functions which the Council is to fulfill may be roughly defined as follows: (1) To express and develop ecumenical consciousness among the Churches and to suggest to them lines of common action. (2) To act for the Churches in the field of agreement in any matter delegated by them, or hereafter to be delegated, it being understood that this action may be taken either for all the Churches together or for any particular Church or group of Churches which may desire it for a specific purpose. (3) To conduct joint study in the field of agreement, with a view to defining more clearly

the social responsibility of the Church (Life and Work) and of clearing away existing obstacles to reunion (Faith and Order). (4) To co-operate with other organizations functioning in the ecumenical field.

The question of representation caused less difficulty than might have been anticipated in view of the extraordinary complication of the relationships to be co-ordinated. The agreement on the plan finally adopted was much facilitated by a preliminary study which had been made of the existing situation by the American representatives of Faith and Order. It was found that the figure originally suggested for the Assembly (300) and its Central Committee (originally 60) were much too small, and both were modified in the interest of inclusiveness.

A difficulty was experienced from the fact that some of the Inter-Confessional organizations desired representation in the Constitution of the World Council while others did not. While no objection was made to the principle of dual representation it seemed best on the whole to continue the existing sectional representation. It was, however, provided that where desired minority Churches not adequately represented in any section might be given places both in the Assembly and its Central Committee, the Churches to be represented in this way being nominated by the Inter-Confessional organizations in question, though the delegates were to be appointed directly by the Churches. The principle of direct appointment by the Church was observed in every case.

One feature in the proposed Constitution is its provision for adequate representation of bodies and of sections not now adequately included either in the Life and Work or in the Faith and Order Movements, namely, the Churches of South Africa, Austral Asia, and of Oceanica, as well as of India, China, and Japan. The phrase, the younger Churches, originally suggested for the latter group, was rejected, and the geographical designation substituted in order to meet the desire of those Churches, eloquently voiced by Doctor Wei of China.

With the completion of the draft of the Constitution, the Conference completed the first part of its task. There remained another, however, scarcely less difficult: namely, to provide for the continuance of the work during the ad interim period. Here a number of difficulties were met with. Among others these: (1) That Faith and Order and Life and Work have very different forms of organization so that no single method of unification is possible. (2) That the Continuation Committee of Faith and Order had re-

served the right to approve the proposed Constitution before its submission to the Churches, and that that Committee does not meet until August 1938. (3) That whereas on the Continent of Europe and in America well organized sections exist which are in a position at once to assume responsibility for their share of any budget approved by the Provisional Committee, in Great Britain no corresponding body exists, though plans for its creation are being undertaken.

The task before the Conference was therefore not a simple one, and the discussion in the Committee which was charged with drafting this part of the plan revealed differences of opinion which it needed tact and patience to overcome. At last, however, complete agreement was reached on the plan, which has already been made public.

The principles which controlled the work of the Committee on Provisional Organization were such as these: (1) That the proposed World Council should not be regarded as a wholly new organization, but so far as possible, as the logical development of the work now being carried on by Life and Work and Faith and Order. (2) That in the organization to be set up parallelism should be maintained so far as possible between the interests represented by Life and Work and those represented by Faith and Order. (3) That in the definition of the function of the proposed Provisional Committee it should be made clear that it must maintain parity between the practical interest and that of research. (4) That with the least possible delay the relationship to existing organizations such as the International Missionary Council, the World Alliance, and the Student Movement, should be defined so as to make possible the continuance of the present friendly co-operation between them. (5) That such new appointments as it seemed necessary to make should be for purposes of co-ordination, and that the existing staff both of Life and Work and of Faith and Order so far as retained, should work in closest co-operation with the new officers so as to make unified administration possible.

In general the hope was expressed that the organization contemplated during the ad interim period would conform as nearly as possible with the plans for the new World Council so that if that Council should be approved by the Churches the transition could be made with a minimum of waste. For this reason, and to assure the continued interest of the Churches, it was decided, if the Assembly of the proposed World Council should not meet within two years, to request the Churches to appoint delegates to a second Conference,

modeled to the plan of Utrecht, to survey the field, suggest any changes which experience might make desirable, and in general give the Committee of Fourteen their counsel during the last stages of the preparatory period.

It was repeatedly pointed out in the course of the discussion that it would make it easier for the Churches which were not represented at Utrecht to approve of the proposed World Council, if it could be shown that the Provisional Organization which it was proposed to set up, was not an entirely new departure but only the continuation, under more effective conditions, of the work in which they were already participating. This was true notably of the German Church, but also to a considerable degree of some of the orthodox Churches. These considerations determined in no small measure the nature and personnel of the provisional organization agreed upon.

There was some difference of opinion as to whether the work to be done in the immediate future should be entrusted to the Committee of Fourteen as a body already known and trusted by the Churches, or whether a new Committee was needed of a more inclusive character. It was finally decided that two Committees were needed but that in order to secure continuity of administration the second Committee should consist of the members of the Committee of Fourteen and their alternates, with six additional persons to be nominated, three by Life and Work and three by Faith and Order. To the Committee of Fourteen was entrusted the task of communicating the plan to the Churches, securing their adhesion as far as possible, and calling the Assembly together when the plan was approved. To insure complete parity of interest in the Committee, the President of Life and Work, Dr. William Adams Brown, was associated as Vice-Chairman with the Chairman, the Archbishop of York, and it was provided that all communications to the Churches until the Assembly was constituted should go in the name of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman. Dr. Visser 't Hooft was appointed Secretary of the Committee, with Doctors Hodgson and Cavert as Associate Secretaries for Faith and Order and Life and Work respectively.

The Archbishop of York was also made Chairman of the second Committee provided for at Utrecht, which was to be known as the Provisional Committee. The function of this Committee was to provide for the carrying on of the existing work up to the constitution of the World Council. For that purpose a budget was approved for the years 1939 and 1940, the necessary staff was appointed, and appeal was made to the Churches to supply the needed funds. Archbishop Germanos, the personal representative of the Ecumeni-

cal Patriarch, Doctor Boegner, President of the French Federation of Churches, and Dr. John R. Mott were chosen as Vice-Chairmen of this Provisional Committee. Dr. Visser 't Hooft was made Secretary, with Rev. William Paton of the International Missionary Council and Dr. Henry Smith Leiper as Associate Secretaries.

A word as to the future. It was generally recognized that the success or failure of the plan will depend upon the proposed World Council having its base in strong national organizations committed to its principles, and willing to assume their share of responsibility for the needed expense. Here, however, we find that the situation is very different in different countries. In America and in many continental countries there are already strong Federations or Councils which can serve as the nucleus of such a national basis. In Great Britain and among the Orthodox Churches there is as yet no such body, though in Great Britain its organization is contemplated and seems to be assured. In the Churches of China, Japan, and India the existing Councils may serve as the nucleus of such a basis. The definition of the status and responsibility of these Councils, and of their relation to the International Missionary Council will no doubt form one of the chief responsibilities of the approaching Madras Conference, to be held in December, 1938.

In general it may be said that the principles which should determine the Constitution and responsibilities of the national sections should be as far as possible those which have determined the Constitution of the World Council itself. They are such as these: (1) that the basis of representation should be official but that there should be the widest possibility of collaboration with Churches not technically included in the Council; (2) that in the constitution of the sections the greatest possible use should be made of the existing co-operative machinery; (3) that in whatever organization is set up Faith and Order and Life and Work should be included on equal terms; (4) that in the definition of function action should be associated with study all along the line; (5) that the services of the staff of each national section should be available to the Central Organization for the performance of specific tasks, so as to avoid the danger of a large and irresponsible overhead.

In the case of the United States this will mean that the services of the Federal Council of Churches, and so far as they are willing, of the local Federations of Churches, should be put at the disposal of the Provisional Committee.

The question of the relation of the Churches not now members of the

Federal Council to that Council, may be left to be determined when the World Council is formed. An analogy of the relationship proposed for the immediate future would be that which the Federal Council held to the General War Time Commission during the war. The General War Time Commission was a more inclusive body than the Federal Council, but the Federal Council put its office and staff at the service of the General War Time Commission.

In any attempt to anticipate the part to be played in the World Council by the American Churches we have to distinguish between the immediate present and the more distant goal. The goal is a time when an enlarged Federal Council shall become the American branch of the World Council; when the different denominations (so far as they still have separate existence) and the local Federations shall be related to it as its constituent parts, and when each local Church shall recognize its responsibility to the cause of Christian unity by putting into its budget as part of its missionary program, a contribution to unity, to be divided between its local, its national and its international expression in a proportion to be agreed upon.

That goal, to be sure, lies in the distant future. In the meantime we have in the American members of the Provisional Committee, and in the existing Joint Executive Committee of Life and Work and Faith and Order, the nucleus of the organization we need during the intervening period. What is important is that this organization be recognized by the denominations as their own, and provisions be made for its support in their budgets, and that a strong and representative Committee of lay persons, men and women, be formed to carry on the needed educational campaign.

I have spoken of the need of enlisting the services of those who hold no official position, men and women. That point needs to be stressed. For the first time so far as I know in history, a World Council of the Churches has recognized in its official Constitution the structural part that lay persons, men and women, hold in the life of the Church. It is for us to give full and generous recognition to this in the form of our national organization.

I have spoken of the part that the American Churches may play in bringing about the World Council, because in the Providence of God it has been given to them to occupy a unique place in the history of the Church. Nowhere else from the first century to this have so many different kinds of Christians been associated with one another in an atmosphere of freedom. Nowhere else is contact between the different types of Christian faith and

life which must be associated in the World Council more easily possible. Nowhere else is there to be found on the same scale the disposition to meet new issues with fresh experiment as among the Churches of our own land. To what country, and to what branch of the Church has God given a parallel opportunity?

But if we are to use it aright we must have faith and courage. Faith to believe that the impossible can be achieved, courage to make the needed sacrifice. We live in great days and great days call for great persons. What we have seen in the last year of difficulties overcome and doors opened, would have seemed to many of us one short year ago impossible. May this be a prophecy of the days that lie ahead. To man the task to which we have set our hands may seem impossible, but we are the servants of one who said when faced with an issue which seemed even more hopeless, "With man it is impossible but with God all things are possible." Let us trust God and go forward.

The Christian Doctrine of Government

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

OF late years in the United States there have been extraordinary changes in the practice of government, and further changes are bruited. To many citizens these changes seem little short of revolutionary. A similar situation exists in England, where indeed the Conservative Party now in power is on the whole rather farther to the left than the Democratic Party in America. But Englishmen and Americans who view recent developments at home as involving fundamental issues are provincial in their domestic concentration. In these countries the established framework of society is not thus far in peril, or even in question save with insignificant minorities; while on the world stage schemes of complete governmental reconstruction in theory as well as in practice are being forcibly agitated. The storm of genuine revolution over Europe and Asia, with tremendous counterblasts of rival doctrines, reduces the political perturbations within these settled systems in America and England to the dimensions of a tempest in a teapot.

We are surely ill-advised to pay so much attention to this local tempest that we fail to take our bearings in the world storm. For the world is today one community, whether we like that fact or no. Isolation is impossible. There are no longer any areas quarantined against foreign infections, physical or mental. Nor can there be while the rivers of commerce still flow, as flow they must, binding all lands and continents together, if millions are not to be doomed to starvation. The affairs of all mankind are our affairs. Unless we come to terms in our own thinking with the terrific tensions of political theory interplaying among many peoples in this hour, we shall be taken unawares, and our ancient liberties will be swept away.

This condition of world strain is sometimes attributed to economic causes. And undoubtedly problems and projects of wealth and its distribution have much to do with maintaining it, while some of the new and strange ideas of government now being urged with crusading ardor are ostensibly motivated by considerations of this sort alone. Nevertheless the real cause of this political turmoil is itself political. Had it not been for the Great War, there would not have been that break-up of traditional patterns which has

rendered social experimentation possible on an unprecedented scale. And the war was a strictly political event. If the economic interests of any of the peoples involved had been candidly consulted in any degree, no such calamity could ever have occurred. It was kindled in the tinder of mass fear and tribal hatreds by the arson of mad and vicious politicians. It is a fatal mistake to overlook the prime import of political ideas and behavior as a causal element in history far outranking, among civilized peoples, all economic interests. If politics be governed by principles coinciding with nature, industry and commerce will be advantaged with all other departments of collective conduct by its operations. If politics be neglected or perverted, every other human value will be in danger of being wrecked. The first business of citizenship is to understand and enforce the basic laws of right government. First get your politics straight, and the rest will in due course naturally follow.

It is from the conviction that at a time like this we Americans must think through what right government means, instead of taking it for granted that we already know all about it, that I have chosen as my topic the Christian doctrine of government. I am not unmindful of the traps which that topic sets for the unwary. But I shall try to avoid them. In the first place, I realize that to talk about a Christian doctrine on a secular subject may arouse distrust, lest in the name of the Church I propound some social dogma, irrelevant to current facts, deduced from authoritarian presuppositions. I admit that the Church has often spoken out of turn, in arbitrary tones, in terms too abstract to carry weight on the scales of reason, and sometimes not without time-serving—bolstering up the status quo in order to curry favor for its pastors with their masters, the princes of the blood or of capital. That is a severe indictment, and not nearly as generally true as the enemies of organized religion like to believe. But no one acquainted with church history can deny that there is some substance in it.

As a true Churchman, however, I give my primary loyalty not to the Church, but to her Lord. And as a liberal Churchman I can never mean church-made dogma when I speak of Christian doctrine. Much dogma is a respectable restatement of Christian doctrine, with legitimate elaborations, in philosophical language. But Christian doctrine itself can never include more than the teachings and example of Jesus Christ. Even the apostolic records in the New Testament lack His authoritativeness. Nor does the authority of Jesus rest upon any special theory of His nature. Rather it is

because men in general have to acknowledge His intrinsic rightness that Christians have formulated a special theory of Jesus' nature to account for it. Jesus still speaks with authority to all who will listen to Him, whatever their creed, simply because His words and works in the Gospels convey an irresistible impression of authentic insight, and mastery of the art of living. Jesus stands in the annals of our race as the supreme example of the poet philosopher who by a genius for understanding life at its roots and in its fruits is a Universal Man. His life remains a Word having the eternal quality, and perennially applicable through all shifting collocations of events, because it gets down to the heart of things and of man and keeps on ringing true.

Again, I do not need to be reminded that Jesus said nothing significant directly upon the subject of government. Indeed He seems never to have commented on such matters, nor even to have referred to the powers that were in His day, save when He was cornered by some inescapable question. These items were not His immediate concern; and, as there was nothing He could do at the moment to affect them, it was better to leave well enough alone. His concern was with a revolution in thinking and motivation far more fundamental, which in proper season would change society from the ground up. There is no more guidance to be derived from His cryptic injunction to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, than from Paul's command, surely ill-timed while Nero was on the throne, to be in subjection to the higher powers, or from the anomalous and abortive venture in communism by the primitive Church at Jerusalem. In vain should we search the Gospels for light on details of political practice.

But the case is different with political theory. For a fundamental theory of politics is none other than a specific phase of some general philosophy of the individual and society and their mutual relations. And on these themes Jesus did speak, oftener and more definitely indeed than on any others save only the being and nature of God. If we would know, then, what is the Christian doctrine of government, we have but to note and apply in a political context what Jesus taught as to men one by one and collectively, and as to what should be the reciprocal bearing of a man and the group to which he belongs.

For the human individual as such no other teacher has ever shown more profound regard and respect. I use the word respect advisedly. There is no taint in Jesus of any notion that men were lost, through their own fault or

by inherited guilt, before He found and delivered them. That dogma is ecclesiastical, not evangelical. Even when He met the down and out, the gutter rats of His day, men and women alike, Jesus never failed of that subtle courtesy which assumed that they were at His own level. Indeed it appears to have been by respecting them so surprisingly that He actually lifted them up from within, so to speak, and gave them a new start. Nor can we find any sign of class or race consciousness in Him. For obvious reasons of convenience and accessibility He dealt chiefly with His own countrymen, it is true; and He was a loyal Jew in spirit to the end. But He did not withhold His amenities from Gentiles who approached Him in a friendly way, while as the very type of fine character He chose a good Samaritan, the Samaritans being that tribe whom the Jews in general most despised and abhorred. One cannot read the parable of the Prodigal Son, moreover, and cherish afterward any doubt but that Jesus viewed every man without exception as a child of God in his own right, and not by adoption only. For personality and its right to individual expression, Jesus had such reverence that He may be called the foremost individualist among the world's masters of mind. The only men for whom He had scorn—and them He condemned scathingly—were the Jews He met who were race-conscious and class-conscious and self-righteous, at the expense of generous universality in their human sympathies.

On the other hand, however, Jesus was no anarchist. Anarchism is the doctrine that the rights of the individual are, as it were, laterally as well as perpendicularly unbounded; that society as such has no right to curb the lawless freedom of any man. Jesus perceived that the vertical development, that is, the upward growth of any man in capacity and character, requires that in lateral relations, that is, in contacts with his fellows upon the human stage, he be subjected, unless he will freely subject himself, to stern restraint in observance of the equal rights of others. He exemplified this necessary social conditioning of personal achievement in the psychic dimensions, which for Him took precedence of all others, by organizing His intimate followers into a peripatetic fraternity in which shared responsibility brought differentiation of function, and daily abrasions of contrasting temperaments rubbed down the rough spots on each man's disposition. The band of the disciples was in embryo a kingdom of God on earth, an equitable world-society resting upon mutual understanding and good will, and employing persuasion as

its only arm against ill will. And the principle thus exemplified was set forth by Jesus in words borrowed from the Old Testament, in which the inherent reciprocity of normal relations between a man and his fellows is expressed with exquisite epigrammatic precision: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is not without relevance, further, to the modern mood at its best, that Jesus defined the relationship between Himself and His followers as that of teacher and pupils, though always this teacher was pointing beyond Himself to God whose truth He was explaining. Though probably of late date, and dubious as biography, the Fourth Gospel seems to catch the very tone of this relationship, concordantly with the Synoptics, in its promise or warning that even after Jesus' earthly ministry had closed much truth would remain for His disciples to learn, and in that magnificent charter of free and fearless enquiry, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." To be seeking truth and perfection rather than dogmatizing about them, to be building toward them by experiment and induction rather than expounding them by deduction from antique scriptures—that seems to have been the intellectual bearing of Jesus. But that is the very description of the liberal temper in contrast with the authoritarian tone.

That men and women of liberal temper today will hope that Jesus was right in defining the individual and society in their mutual contacts and obligations as He did, is to be anticipated. And natural science would here seem to confirm the authority we feel in Jesus' insight. We are told nowadays that no two things in the universe are exactly alike; that when things are pigeonholed together in a class it is because of certain major resemblances, by conventional abstraction from individual differences, and merely for purposes of statistical convenience. Moreover, from top to bottom of the gamut of the organic we find that the individual is a product of and is permanently conditioned by his kind, while at the same time—and the more evidently, the higher one climbs on this scale—the individual in his turn brings his own distinctive contribution to the group, in some degree remaking it, and further conditioning its future. In every species individuals and society stand over against each other in a sort of necessary polarity, so that neither can the individual survive without society, nor can society flourish without the individual at his best, which means at his most individual. No one knows as yet for sure the modus of organic evolution; but it seems a safe guess that even below man's level life has progressed only by virtue of individual

variations or specializations which in the long run proved beneficial to the race as a whole.

We are confronted, then, in the teaching of Jesus, significantly supported by scientific indications, with a doctrine of private rights socially controlled against anti-social expression in the very interest of the individual himself, and of that upward growth of his own particularities, as against lateral dissipation—like the pruning of a tree—which will in the end yield maximum returns of benefit both to himself and to his group. We must bear this delicate balance of individual and society in mind, admitting and conserving the rights of each, as we return to the arena of present world controversy anent politics or the philosophy of government, to examine the competitors in this field as to their conformity with the just norm thus determined.

There are three such contestants today. And the first point to be noted, as an encouraging proof that the world does move, is that the divine right of kings is not among them. Not that monarchy has disappeared, or is everywhere a mere shadow and symbol. In several Balkan lands, for instance, the King is a mighty factor—but rather through approximation to the corporative State, with the King as dictator, than on any basis of the innate prerogatives of royalty. In Japan the Emperor reigns upon a summit of supposed divinity; but his rule is subject to determining influences in internal affairs from a multi-colored parliament not without democratic affiliations, and from ministers of war and marine independent of parliament, imparting a fascistic tinge to foreign policy. In the twentieth century the captains are still with us, but the kings depart.

The first chronologically of two new types of government which challenge general acceptance is Communism, a term borrowed in its current sense by Lenin from the Paris Commune of 1871 as a designation of Marxianism after continental socialism had succumbed to separatist war pressures. The Marxian ideology commends itself to Christian approval to the extent that it champions the rights of the common man and attacks the dominance of the profit motive in society. Moreover, in the great Russian experiment there can be little question but that many things have been accomplished incidentally which are of general human value.

These values in motivation and achievement are, however, rather beside the point. Marx bases his whole imposing logical structure upon economic determinism. He denies to the individual all freedom and dignity except

as a creature and subject of the community. Further, man as he deals with him is only the economic man, who is in fact as non-existent as the average man—a pure abstraction. So the Marxian psychology is completely vitiated. Nothing save its denial of freedom to the private will reveals this vice more patently than the proposal to eliminate the profit motive. It must be obvious to every objective student of human nature that material self-interest is as integral a constituent of personality, and as indispensable at rudimentary stages of development, as is physical fear. A man would be less than a man if he lacked either. Neither can be uprooted, but both can be transcended. The way to altruism lies mainly not through legislation but by the improvement of character. Some sinister practical results of this utter devaluation of the individual and his ruthless enslavement to the mass will and mass processes are vividly suggested in André Gide's sympathetic but reluctantly critical report of a recent Russian sojourn, "Retour de l'U. R. S. S."

While Communism urges its worldwide appeal to reformers on the surface and in a hurry through its vociferations in behalf of the neglected working classes, a second new type of state theory has come to the fore on the initiative of Italy, and has already won wide sway, notably (with extravagant modifications in the direction of racialism) in Germany. Fascism or the corporative State is not without its attraction in turn, also, even to Christians. A Christian realist will admit that the inevitable differentiation of functions in society must work some corresponding differentiation of social status. A class system is not in itself counter to the Gospel, provided it is elastic enough to deny no man his right to improve his rank and condition if he has it in him to do so. And clearly Christianity is concerned for firmness of public administration and strict law enforcement, for otherwise there can be no security in reasonable well-being for either the upper crust or the under dog. Now the corporative State, as social philosophers have rationalized it in Mussolini's wake, stands emphatically for a just mutual ordering of all occupations, and the groups representing them in the commonwealth, under a strong central executive, which prevents encroachments and overreaching on the part of any group, and directs co-ordinated national effort to ends which it judges most advisable for the welfare of the nation and all its members.

If that were all there was to it, doubtless we should all be Fascists. It is this picture of Fascism, studiously playing up the high lights, concealing the shadows, and illustrating its merits by the transformation wrought in post-

war Italy from virtual anarchy under a degraded parliamentarianism into a strong, healthy, unified, well-ordered society, which makes the system thus delineated so engaging to the imagination of many Americans. Our danger in America, if danger there be, is not mainly from Communism, which is alien to our ethos, but from Fascism, which answers to our instincts for neatness and efficiency. Of course we should have to rebaptize it with an American name. We might call it the Liberty League, for example.

But, alas, such a picture as we have just been studying leaves out the most signal factors in the corporative State. What those factors are we can discern by scrutinizing the concept of the strong central executive, which is to decide upon the aims of national procedure and superintend the pursuit of them. What or who is this executive? In Italy, Mussolini; in Germany, Hitler. With Lenin and Stalin, these are probably the most interesting figures on the post-war scene; but fearfully interesting, like Attila and Napoleon. How were they chosen? They chose themselves. Who will choose their successors, if any? Their own private cliques. Where do the people come in? They don't. What rights has the individual? None, except the right to approve of everything the government does. If he exercises that right, he will be given bread and circuses, along with plenty of work; if he fails to exercise it, exile, prison, or the scaffold awaits him. What are the aims which the strong central executive deems advisable for national endeavor? Recall Italy's conquest of Abyssinia, and the unilateral revision of Germany's treaties. These aims are subsumed in national glory—meaning aggrandizement at the expense of others under menace of arms. Why should such aims, essentially destructive of man power and wealth, be chosen? For two reasons. First, because a dictator's authority rests upon the army, so the army must be given what it wants, and that is the sort of thing which armies always want. Second, because the savage in every man's breast can be readily made to march with enthusiasm in the ranks, and keep step, and obey orders, if the commanding officer excites his bloodlust and promises to sate it. There is nothing like war fever to keep the masses docile under heartless regimentation.

This talk of bloodlust and the will to war warrants a remark on nationalism so-called, in lands as yet free of dictators, as furnishing fertile soil for the seeds of military autocracy—which is what the corporative State really means, in less delicate language. We ought to resent the term "nationalism" in this connection, and insist on saying "statism" instead. For nationalism or

statism consists primarily in the false identification of the nation with the State. Properly the nation is land plus people plus all living processes, of which the State is only one, and one of the less important—having essentially no more than the police function of preserving order so that other things more vital can be done with a minimum of disturbance and interruption. If the nation is held to be the State, then its interests lie in unscrupulous competition with other states for reputation and international influence. These interests are to be protected and prosecuted by the usual police methods—first, armed threats against the unamenable; second, if threats fail, by using the weapons previously paraded. Under this jolly scheme of reciprocal brigandage, with no state owing any respect to anything beyond itself save intimidation by a stronger force, the world becomes a bloody arena, with common men of all nationalities as the gladiators, and the politicians, their lords, sitting safely in the galleries, all of them with their thumbs down. Wherever one finds magniloquent—which is to say loud-mouthed—patriots declaiming grandeur and defiance in the name of their country, and turning such inspiring symbols of the nation as the flag and the national anthem into sacraments of the State (which is like worshiping the holy police department), there one may be sure that war is just around the corner if they get their way, and dictatorship is a not improbable domestic outcome of such a fray. To bring the matter home, we have far more reason here in America to fear our perfervid and ostentatious patriots than our little band of radicals. The self-styled patriots have it in them to do a great deal more harm. They are stupidly doing their utmost to sink the ship of state by boring from within. The radicals merely bombard the ship with bubbles.

As in the case of all other propositions ever seriously broached among mankind, there is naturally something to be said for both Communism and Fascism. It is hardly possible to be wholly wrong about anything. Even if I were to say that two and two are five, the two twos and the five severally would still be proper integers. But as with this sum, so with collectivism in both of its contemporary expressions. There is more to be said against Communism and Fascism than for them; and it is more important. The root of all valid objections to them lies in the fact that they destroy the proper balance of society, as we find it pointed out both in nature and in the teaching of Jesus which so faithfully and penetratingly interprets nature, by denying the freedom of the individual, which is one of the weights in that balance. Communism is deterministic in theory as well as in practice, denying the

individual as a source of creative social action. And in practice at least Fascism is also utterly deterministic. Under its sway the individual exists for the State, and is conceded no rights or powers apart from it. But no philosophy of government, no matter what its pragmatic attestation, can ever be accepted by Christians or liberals—that is, by men who cherish humane ideals and pursue truth without compromise—if it denies either man's freedom on the one hand, or on the other his social responsibility, and the right of society to curb him in lateral action, to prevent social behavior obstructive or destructive of the general good.

There remains, then, democracy; which in modern parlance means representative democracy, or government of the people for the common welfare by delegates popularly chosen and with a periodically revocable mandate. There is much to be said against democracy, to be sure; and of late years it has all been said. As a theory it arose in the eighteenth century among absurd doctrinaires. In practice it has been repeatedly, even habitually, falsified by popular indifference and political inefficiency and corruption. In emergencies it seems almost necessary that it should be superseded by at least a guarded form of one-man control, to ensure promptness and adequacy of action. As an achievement it is to date halting, uncertain, undependable. It has not yet brought anything like equal accessibility of economic opportunity to all men, or a distribution of wealth proportioned to merit and service, though these are among its prime objectives.

But let it be remembered that, though older by a century and a half than Communism and Fascism, and by nature far less spectacular, democracy as we understand the term is still a relative newcomer in world thought and affairs, while by the very sanctions of general intelligence and civic interest which it invokes for its success it must of necessity develop slowly. So longtime a project as the achievement of liberty guaranteed by law, in a fair allocation of both, through the gradual education of the electorate into a judicious state of mind and full political competence, can be now no more than at the beginning of its course. Will the experiment survive? No experiment can survive if it has not truth on its side. But no experiment, once launched, can ever be stopped, however stubborn be the opposition to it from time to time, if the principle underlying it is true. As students of the mind of Christ, we cannot but see that the democratic idea in government at length and alone has emerged to accord with Jesus' insight into the reciprocity of man and society, with equal and complementary dignity and privileges. As

students of the nature of man in society, as it is revealed by biology, psychology, and sociology—which concur in stressing both the individual as the source of significant variation, and the collectivity as the individual's indispensable medium and conditioning—we shall find in the whole realm of political experience and doctrine no other philosophy of government so coterminous as democracy with the representation of humanity in little and in large which the sciences yield.

So I make bold to assert that democracy is in principle the one doctrine of government which enlightened Christians can support. The English-speaking peoples, and a few others still true to this ideal, are engaged in an undertaking baffling in its complexity, not a little discouraging at its present stage, and under heavy fire from many quarters today, yet which holds the only promise we can find of ultimate justice within and among all nations, for all individuals, classes and races, untainted by the anti-scientific and anti-religious antipathies and particularisms which still estop the realization of the age-old dream of world brotherhood. Carry democracy far enough, without suffering it to be made the shibboleth or pretext of any special group buttressing its selfish interest against the radical demands of equity, and it will one day end oppressions, depressions, and war everywhere. Carry it far enough, indeed, and from man's side it will prove to be that course of action which God will confirm and augment by the bringing in of His earthly kingdom, the sovereignty of true and enduring laws over human affairs ordered upon the persuasions of manifest reason.

The times call for many expedients in the region of political technology. As to these expedients we must continue to disagree until we find out, by testing them, which of them will work and which must fail. But beyond all expedients and the partisan debates they engender, the times call supremely for the rededication of Christian idealism to that principle of government which uniquely harmonizes with the constitution of man in nature and with the mind of Christ—the democratic concept and purpose of controlled individualism moving by reason and persuasion to the ends of general security and amelioration. Here all parties can agree, in unanimity of reprobation for any and all politics which would deny the individual his right to be himself at his individual best, and in wholehearted protagonism for the hard-won liberties we now enjoy, and their final extension among all men.

The Ethical Supremacy of Jesus

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM

WAS Jesus the ethical and spiritual revealer of God to men or, primarily, only an "eschatological itinerant preacher" and "exorcist"? If He was the latter could He have been also the former? These are questions of great urgency for Christian theology today. The eschatological interpretation of Jesus has been gaining ground ever since it was first effectively advanced by Johannes Weiss in 1896 in *The Preaching of Jesus Concerning the Kingdom of God*. It has taken different forms at the hands of such scholars as Loisy, Schweitzer, Rudolf Otto and Baltmann, but it cannot be put aside as irrelevant. There is every reason to believe that it has meant the recovery of a factor for the understanding of Jesus and His times which had been long overlooked. It has compelled the recognition of an integral element in the message of Jesus and in the promulgation of the gospel. Yet in the exaggerated place which has been given to it there lies the liability of a distorted perspective which may seriously misrepresent Jesus' fundamental purpose and cripple the vitality and progress of the Christian faith.

THE INHERENT SUPREMACY OF NEW TESTAMENT ETHICS

In interpreting Christianity, and the place which the personality and teaching of Jesus has in it, it is becoming constantly clearer that *the Gospels contain a body of ethical teaching inherently and incomparably superior in quality and in power of conviction and persuasion*. Even if its absolute superiority is not granted it cannot be questioned that the Christian ethic reveals an extraordinary and unrivaled rigor and persuasive power. How is this to be accounted for? What is its meaning for Christianity and for humanity?

Whatever may be the more remote sources and the later modifications of the Christian ethos the fact that it is so closely attached to a *single historic person*, gaining its unity and power from Him, is of paramount meaning. It is strange how imperfectly this has been apprehended by generations of those who call Him "Lord, Lord." Liberal scholarship has fallen as far short of recognizing this as orthodox Christology. Both have been almost

entirely engaged, each in its own way, with theories *about* Jesus rather than with *Himself*. Not that this circling about Him and concern with record and circumstance and theory has been fruitless. During its progress much has been educed that throws light upon Him and upon the Christian faith. But such circumlocution is entirely inadequate.

It is less the *content* of the teaching of Jesus than its quality, its inner *authority* (in contrast to the authoritarianism of the scribes) which distinguishes it as unique. Its originality lies not in its novelty so much as in the intense realism and vitality which characterize it. Professor Whitehead has very pertinently pointed out that "the procedure of taking consequences seriously marks the real discovery of a theory."¹ The teaching of Jesus bears the nature of discovery in this sense. *There is an elemental freshness in it like that of a spiritual dawn and a finality like that of the starry heavens.* It is supremely authentic. It is inexhaustible in its resources and its restorative potency. The beatitudes, the "golden rule," the injunctions to forgiveness, fall "like the gentle rain from heaven" upon the teachable spirit; while the warning against judging others, the arraignment of self-righteousness, inhumanity and indifference stab the slothful soul awake to the inescapable obligations of man to man and man to God. There is a note of ethical reality here not to be found in anything like the same degree elsewhere—a spiritual pulsation that moves the soul to its centre. Here is ethics in its native, autonomous validity, transfused and vitalized by deep religious feeling.

Not (let it be repeated) that these ethical principles are strictly new or unprecedented. Had they been they would not have made their universal appeal. There are here the same elemental moral sinews that one finds, in principle at least, in the Mosaic law, in the code of Hamurabai, in Confucian morals, in the Eightfold Path of Buddha, in the ethics of Stoicism, and in Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*. Why then this peculiar convincingness, this arrowy directness, this incomparable persuasiveness, this serious yet joyous atmosphere of eternal verity? There can be but one answer: *they emanate from a supremely endowed and puissant ethical and spiritual personality.*

THE ETHICAL IMPERATIVE BLENDED WITH EXPERIENTIAL WISDOM

It is not merely the didactic clarity and dynamic impact of Jesus' teach-

¹ *The Concept of Nature*, p. 28.

ing that is so arresting and convincing. There is in it a certain unique and incomparable union of insight and wisdom that makes it intellectually convincing as well as morally and spiritually compelling. In form as well as content His sayings are akin to those of all the great ethical teachers, yet also *sui generis*. Here are the seasoned maturity of Confucius, the selflessness of Gautama, the abounding hopefulness of Second Isaiah, and the sad sincerity of Jeremiah, all transfused and transfigured. Such words as: "Many that are first shall be last and the last first;" "These things ought ye to have done and not to have left the others undone;" "To whom much is given of him shall much be required;" "For to him that loveth much, much is forgiven" are not merely epigrammatic and arresting, penetrative and illuminating, but antiseptic and restorative, as coming from a Great Physician of the soul.

The clear discrimination between motive and act—with marked emphasis upon the former yet with due recognition of the latter also—reflects a penetrative moral discernment that has given to Christian ethic a character of its own. What words are so translucent, so purely ageless and contemporary, so remote, in tone and spirit, from the excitement of an impending cataclysm, as these: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;" "Except ye repent and become as a little child ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God;" "The kingdom of God is within you." If Jesus were simply, or even *primarily*, an evangelist of the end of the age, such calm and serene sayings as these, with those concerning the "mysteries" of the Kingdom (mysteries as far as possible from the esotericisms and crudities of the mystery religions), could with difficulty be associated with Him.

The parables of The Pearl of Great Price, The Treasure in the Field, The Wheat and the Tares, The Ten Virgins, and others may well reflect the molding touch of the Group Mind of early Christianity as it met the opportunities and difficulties of an urgent evangelism. Yet the most impressive thing about these, as about all the parables, is their truth to human nature in every age, in the face of duty and opportunity. The Group Mind that fashioned such sayings, in whatever degree, must have been itself created by One who reflected creatively upon human life, individual and social, as it is in every age and clime. As for the "biological parables" of the Kingdom, as they have been termed, there appears in them an insight into the law of growth in the spiritual realm that it is difficult to assign to any other than Jesus Himself, at least originally. It may be difficult to

harmonize these parables with sayings of His as to the immediacy of the coming kingdom, but if so their profound recognition of developmental process should not be allowed to suffer in the process. To force them into conformity with a narrowly apocalyptic view is questionable historical and literary interpretation.

THE UNITING OF APPARENT OPPOSITES

The masterly use of *paradox*—without which it is impossible to convey the intricate strains and balances of moral and spiritual truth—is another indication of an insight of transcendent quality in the gospel ethic.

One of the finest, most moving things about the ethical principles of Jesus—that which carries them straight to the heart as well as the conscience of humanity—is that with all their austerity, their sternness and thoroughness, there is blended so genuine a tenderness, so wide a charity, and so deep a sense of the Everlasting Mercy. This union of righteousness and tenderness comes out, quite naturally, even more in His direct dealings with actual men and women, and in the parables, than in His more formal teaching. The Father of the Prodigal, the Forgiving Creditor, the *a fortiori* Just Judge, the Good Samaritan—these inexpressibly moving and beautiful vignettes melt the bitterness of the hardened heart and produce a doubly changed attitude—toward God and toward fellow man. Here indeed speaks One who “knew what is in man”—and what is in God.

To one who has a sufficient sense of proportion and perspective it may cause no disturbance to think that such a teacher expected the end of the Age—and that perhaps soon—*provided this expectation was secondary with Him to the purpose of awakening men to God and to themselves*. Unless His deepest and most fundamental purpose was moral renewal, it is reasonable to conclude that He never could have gained such a permanent hold upon men.

PERENNIAL VERSUS INTERIM ETHICS

In its essential nature clearly here is no mere *Interim Ethics*, unless it be in the sense that true ethic is in its very nature *interim*, that is, urgent and decisive.² Here are the principles which define the right relations of man to his own soul, to his fellows, and to God, in every age. “Drawn out in

² This is manifestly the sense in which Professor Whitehead writes: “The greatness of Christianity—the greatness of any valuable religion—consists in its ‘interim ethics.’”

living characters" in this "Son of Man," they have guided, uplifted, saved, sustained countless sons of men wherever the gospel has gone.

Shining through the gospel *memorabilia*—however disjunct and incomplete these may be—illuminating, governing, creating all—is a *personality* of such purity and strength, such reverence and freedom, such magnanimity and gentleness, such moral majesty and spiritual grace as have made Him time-conquering and ethically creative above every other. His "mild sway" has extended ever more widely, constructively, redeemingly, until it has become the chief uplifting influence in the modern world. Even though, in the transmission of His words and deeds, many shapings and some misshapings of a collective mind are to be found, the main attitudes and affirmations are clearly attributable only to a Master Mind whose individuality and character are stamped indelibly upon the gospel sayings. The fact that there are attributed to Him so many apothegms which bear the marks of community and evangelistic formulation, indicates how creatively His spirit pervaded and fashioned the whole process of the spread of the gospel in adapting it to existing conditions and environment.

THE WITNESS OF DISCIPLESHIP

An indirect but very weighty evidence of the magnetic quality of Jesus' character and the moral transcendence of His personality and teaching is to be found in the disciples whom He attached to Himself and *transformed into His likeness yet at the same time into their own uniqueness.*

No evidence of the redemptive character of His influence could be greater than the freedom and completeness of the surrender to Him of a mind of such independence and originality, such scope and sagacity, such ardor of devotion and tenacity of purpose, as the apostle to the Gentiles. Whether Paul ever saw Jesus or not, he was captured, held, regenerated, by His personality. There is no parallel in history of this discipleship, in its elevation and intensity and its creative consequences. That of Plato for Socrates comes nearest but falls far short in depth and completeness. And the discipleship of Paul is but one of a continuous succession of such personal loyalties. Peter was the first of a discipleship of men and women of passionate ardor and practical zest, as Paul was the first of a long line of minds of the highest intellectual and spiritual capacity, who have given to the Man of Galilee a whole-hearted and tireless devotion such as witnesses incomparably to the redemptive quality of His personality and His mission.

THE TIMES OF JESUS THE FRAME FOR HIS PORTRAIT

The *personality* (the term is too abstract and academic but there is no other) that shines through the gospel words and incidents is too universal, too human-and-divine in endowment and mission, to be narrowed to the compass of the time-conditioning which He shared with His contemporaries. His times frame Him but cannot confine Him. In one sense Jesus stands forth even more distinct and vital by reason of the removal of that dependence upon exact detail and *ipsissima verba* which has too long drawn attention away from Himself to fasten it upon things *about* Him.

Sound historic interpretation should not permit itself to be so absorbed in tithing the mint and anise and cummin of particulars concerning Him (although this has its definite place) as to neglect the weightier matter of the abiding wholeness and creativeness of this One who being lifted up draws all men to Himself. For, judged by the nature and laws of the realm of persons, He is far more than a mere historic figure, who came and went at a given moment in a transitory historic order. Rather does He so incarnate the Divine and Eternal, that having once entered the historic-personal realm He cannot be expunged from it. He continues within the widening fellowship of personal relationships as One wrought into the very fiber of humanity, touching myriads of lives transformingly and continuously. He is as real today—more real in many ways—than when He walked the hills and valleys of Palestine. He is, as Nicolas Berdyaev has called Him, “our eternal contemporary.” Not without reason has humanity “crowned Him with glory and honor”—idealized Him if you will—found in Him, that is, the ideal of what man should strive to become, whether in the first century or the twentieth.

In this unsought redemptive supremacy, not of rank but of potency, Jesus promises to continue and increase, whatever the changing emphases of historical criticism, having been found worthy of it by all sorts and conditions of men in the testing fires of twenty centuries of human life and experience.

The Problem of Pain and the Doctrine of Immortality

JOHN PATERSON

THE problem of human suffering is still with us and its haunting presence throws religion into the interrogative mood. "My God, My God, why?" are almost the last words of the Lord of Glory and they are repeated in many a poignant expression today.

"O I wad like to ken [know] to the beggar wife, says I,
The reason o' the cause and the wherefore o' the why,
Wi' many anither riddle brings the tear into my e'e [eye]:
It's gey [very] an' easy speirin' [asking] said the beggar wife to me."

(R. L. Stevenson.)

This attitude of interrogation is present in the Old Testament but it does not emerge at the beginning of the history. It is possible to soothe oneself with a false philosophy and one can live long with an inadequate theology. Thus it is easy to see the meaning of Bacon's dictum that "prosperity is the beatitude of the Old Testament," though it may not be so easy to understand why "adversity is the beatitude of the New Testament." A great conflict has to be settled before we pass from the former position to understanding and acceptance of the latter.

The Old Testament position is clear, and more logical than one might suspect at first glance. Do good and you will get the goods. Piety brings prosperity; that is written in the constitution of the universe. "There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil. And there were born unto him seven sons and three daughters. His substance also was . . . a very great household; so that this man was the greatest of all the men of the East." That is plain enough and easily understood. That was all as it should be according to ancient ideas, for the early Hebrew had no outlook beyond this world of time and sense. If there is a good God ruling over life then a man's outward circumstance must correspond to his inward character. Otherwise there will be anomalies of a moral kind in the universe and God's righteousness will be impugned. But this is precisely

what the Hebrew would not do; his basic principle was the righteousness of God. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis 18.25.) That is the logic of the matter, but life is more than logic. It emerges all through the Old Testament, but perhaps the clearest formulation of the doctrine is found in the first Psalm, which is a kind of foreword to the whole Psalter:

"That man hath perfect blessedness
Who walketh not astray
In counsel of ungodly men
Nor stands in sinners' way,
Nor sitteth in the scorner's chair,
But placeth his delight
Upon God's law, and meditates
On his law day and night.

"He shall be like a tree that grows
Near planted by a river,
Which in his season yields his fruit
And his leaf fadeth never;
And all he doth shall prosper well.
The wicked are not so:
But like they are unto the chaff
Which wind drives to and fro.

"In judgment therefore shall not stand
Such as ungodly are;
Nor in th' assembly of the just
Shall wicked men appear.
For why? the way of godly men
Unto the Lord is known;
Whereas the way of wicked men
Shall quite be overthrown."

(Scots metrical version.)

Righteous conduct brings reward; religion is profitable and pays dividends. Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament.

There is, however, a fearful corollary to this theology. If prosperity is the outward sign of inward piety, then poverty must be the mark and token of inward corruption and sin. Thus the conclusion was inevitable that "*all sufferers are sinners*" and there is no gospel for the poor in the Old Testament. For that very reason there is no real asceticism in the Old Testament; poverty here was not only an economic disaster, it was a spiritual calamity, a proof of sin and rejection by God. "We esteemed him smitten of God and afflicted." (See Isaiah 53.4.) The poor man simply does

not have a chance; his character is slain with a syllogism and his "own familiar friend lifts up his heel against him." (Cp. Psalm 41.9.) Job's friends were at least sound theologically; they were faithful "to their lights."

Old theologies, like old soldiers, never die. They meet us in unexpected places and often in surprising form. "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" (John 9.2.) Ideas such as these have a wider vogue than is commonly imagined; they constitute the theological stock-in-trade of the average church member, as many pastors will testify. Progressive revelation progresses very slowly.

We propose to deal briefly with the problem of suffering and to indicate various interpretations as offered in the Old Testament. Thereafter we shall emphasize one aspect that emerges faintly in the old dispensation but shines clear in the New Testament, namely, the emergence of a doctrine of immortality as a postulate of faith and an inference from the revealed character of God. Thus the matter will be set in its proper orientation.

We begin here with the prophet Habakkuk who has been called "the father of speculation in Israel." He speculates because the facts of life are contradicting the theology of his time. His date is about 615 B. C. The pious, he observes, are not prosperous but very much otherwise. The precise reference to internal or external politics may not be quite clear, but the question at issue is shining clear. "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity: *wherefore* lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?" (Habakkuk 1. 13.) Religion is set in a strident mood of interrogation. An answer comes but it does not say much, only "Wait"; in the long run all will be well and character will triumph. "The soul of the oppressor is not straight," and nothing with a crook or twist or bend will survive finally, "but the just shall live by his fidelity." (Habakkuk 2. 4.) But "the long run" may be too long for the average life, and Habakkuk does not carry us very far. It is not easy to practice "the patience of the saints" when life is sorely baffled by bewildering anomalies, and a famine of justice is likely to produce delirium of conscience; "How long, O lord, how long?" It does seem strange that Nero should be on the throne and Paul languishing in prison, but, as Fosdick remarks, a day comes when men are constrained to call their children Paul and their dogs Nero. "I believe in the ultimate decency of things, ay, and though I woke in hell I would still believe in it" (R. L. Stevenson). In each of

these instances man is asserting that the soul of the universe is just, and proclaiming the fact of moral continuity. The Judge of all the earth will do right but to our impatience His purposes do not always "ripen fast."

There is always danger in rousing sleeping dogmas but once the question had been raised it refused to be put aside. The facts of life clamored for a restatement of belief and a new creed had to be struck out on the anvil of the human heart. About this same time Jeremiah was preaching and witnessing a goodly confession and often enough he sets religion in the interrogative mood; "Righteous art thou, O Lord, yet would I reason the matter with thee, *why?*" (See Jeremiah, 12.1.) In presence of such an agonizing spirit men did not dare to repeat the old axiom and rob Jeremiah of his character. They began to modify and qualify the old theology and they said "*Some sufferers are saints,*" and after the great discipline of the Exile, when they saw one more wonderful and awesome than Jeremiah, the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 52.13-53.12, they modified it further and they said "*Some sufferers are saviours.*"

But we are moving rather fast and must halt for a moment. It should be noticed here that the problem arises first in the case of the nation. The individual had not yet come to his own. But he does come to his own in the book of Job, a book which could not be written before 400 B. C., though the poet may have used earlier material. The prose prologue and epilogue may be part of an earlier story, but the intervening poem is from a later hand and alone concerns us here. The speeches of Elihu are a late addition added by someone who thought the problem had not been solved. The friends of Job represent the orthodox dogma and ply Job with reiterated arguments to show he must have sinned. Theirs is the method of the mosquito and it stings Job to fury. But if there is one thing Job is certain of it is the consciousness of his own integrity; that is his fundamental certainty which he will not let go. The accumulated force of the arguments of the three friends will not shake that. The tragic schism is in his soul and it is reflected in his speech. The friends' God is the God of things as they are, but Job is searching for the God of things as they ought to be. We are witnessing the birthpangs of a new and more adequate theology.

"Earth, cover not my blood,
And let my cry have no resting place.
Even now, behold, in heaven is my witness,
And my advocate is on high.

My friends are my scorers:
 But unto God my eye poureth tears
 That he would plead for man with God
 As man pleads for his neighbor!
 For a few years will pass,
 And I shall go the way whence I shall not return."

(Job 16. 18-22.)

In that passage is contained all the agony and travail of an old-time pilgrim seeking the living God—the great God who cannot be packed into the brief compass of a cruel uncouth creed. Friends may forsake him but God is just and will do right. But it may be too late; oh, let the good God intervene now and clear His servant Job! And yet the impatient "How long, O Lord, how long?" of these saints often seems to find no response; our hot and dusty questionings get no answer. It seems to the present writer that the situation becomes so tense that something like a "deus ex machina" is required to cut the knot. And so we have that great passage (Job 19.25-27):

"I know that my Vindicator lives,
 And that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:
 And though after my skin worms destroy this body,
 Yet in my flesh shall I see God:
 Whom I shall see for myself,
 And mine eyes shall behold, and not another.
 My reins are consumed within me."

The text is notoriously corrupt and the corruption goes back beyond the versions; the thought appears too big for the copyists and they stumble on it. But the general sense is quite clear even in the Authorized Version, and it is not possible to eliminate the thought of something like immortality. The poet, however, would not solve the matter in this way; for him the world of time and sense was the only world he knew. That is what makes the Old Testament such a brave book, that men could, and did live such lives without the hope of immortality. But there is a point to be made here. Job gets a momentary flash, a fleeting vision that does not tarry. It was born in distress, a postulate of faith in the midst of despair; it is a vision that overwhelms and staggers Job and he cannot take it in; from the mount of vision he returns to the dusty levels of sheer argumentation. But a candle was here lit that could not be put out; this gleam will grow to fuller light. We can trace its growth and significance.

We may leave Job for the moment and follow certain traces of develop-

ment in the Psalter. Psalm 37 is interesting in this respect for it is later than Job and still reveals the old belief. Nevertheless the writer protests too much, and his repeated assertions of the old axiom convey the suggestion that he is not too sure of things. "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers . . . trust in the Lord and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed." The writer seems to hear rumblings of discontent and suggestions that what in the way of religion was good enough for grandfather may not be good enough for his grandson. But he gives the old view renewed expression and sums it up with an air of finality, "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread." (Psalm 37.25.) Of course it is always possible to put on blinders or pull down the shades and refuse to see; in that case we wonder what means all the talk about a Social Problem. For all his piety the Psalmist here was purblind.

Psalm 49 carries us a step further; he is acutely conscious of the problem and seeks a solution. There are textual difficulties here but they do not affect the main sense. By general agreement this is regarded as an "immortality Psalm." He pushes the solution in some ways to the other side. The rich shall be "laid in the grave;" "death shall feed on them," "but God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave: for he shall receive me." Resurrection here is only for the righteous. It may not be wise to read too much into all this, but we need not read too little out of it. The writer is thinking of resurrection, limited it may be only to the pious, and the pious are not the rich and prosperous.

Psalm 73 represents the high-water mark of this development in the Old Testament. Here a writer is telling his spiritual pilgrimage and how he had attained to certainty. He had almost slipped and had been on the brink of a great betrayal; he had almost said there is no morality in the government of the universe, but he had gone in his despair to the sanctuary. There his eyes were opened and he saw to the very center of things. "God's in his heaven, All's right with the world." "Once I was blind but now I see," and see to the roots and realities of things. There is something triumphant about his first word "Nevertheless"; it is the exultant cry of a faith that has triumphed over the world.

"Nevertheless I am continually with thee: thou hast holden me by my right hand.
Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.

My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever." (Psalm 73. 23-26.)

What has this man seen? He has seen and seen clearly that the love of God is omnipotent and cannot be defeated; he has learned and in his heart he knows and is persuaded that when a man forms a friendship with God and puts his hand in His, nothing in earth or hell will pluck him from that grasp. "Love is strong as death . . . many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it." (Song of Songs 8. 6, 7.) The waters of the last cold river shall part and stand on heaps that the redeemed of the Lord may go through in safety, and all the trumpets shall sound for them on the other side. God is stronger than "the strong man armed"; love is mightier far. To mention death in presence of such friendship is an impertinence and an irrelevance.

Such a view, of course, is exceptional and just as Job's vision was overpowering and left his poor thought far behind, so also this seemed to outstrip man's imagination. Few could climb to such a lonely height in the Old Testament and many found the view of Ecclesiastes more appealing. Ecclesiastes may be dated about 250 B. C. and is the logical opposite of the view just stated. It is the sheer denial of a future life; it is the voice of rank skepticism. Life has beaten the preacher and given him the knockout blow. It is a long trail from Koheleth to Paul and his "more than conquerors." Life for Ecclesiastes has no meaning; Whirl is king and life has no purpose.

"Bubble of bubbles! all things are a Bubble!
What is the use of all man's toil and trouble?
Year after year the crop comes up and dies
The earth remains, Mankind is only stubble."

(Ecclesiastes 1. 2. Translated by F. C. Burkitt.)

But worse than that, there is no morality in the whole sorry scheme of things; the soul of the universe is not upright.

"It's a big Bubble, ah! how often met,
That Good men suffer what the Bad should get,
And Bad men get rewarded like the Good
Yet seeing such injustice do not fret;
"Be cheerful still, for better Lot there's none
For any man, when all is said and done
Than food sufficient and a cheerful mind
To ease his work thro' Life under the Sun."

(Ecclesiastes 8. 14, 15. Burkitt's trans.)

Job had said something like this in heat, but Ecclesiastes says it all in cold

blood. It is all "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," perhaps Greek thought, and Ecclesiastes is a sick soul with a sickening philosophy. Will there be any end to it all? is there no purpose anywhere?

"God's Aim—how difficult it is to trace!
I've seen Rogues sitting in the Judge's place,
The Bad man sits where Righteousness should be,
And Merit stands before him in Disgrace.

"God lets the wicked flourish; no doubt He
Will judge them justly, but it seems to me
That He has made men for Experiment
To try what kind of animals they be.

"For one event comes both to Man and Beast,
There's no Distinction when the Breath has ceased;
As one dies, so the other-Bubbles both,
And Man nowise superior in the least.

"Who knows the Breath of Man is upward bound,
While the Beast's Breath sinks downward to the Ground?
Out of the Dust we came, to Dust we go;
All things return to tread the unchanging Round.

"So I see nothing Better can be got
Than Work and taking pleasure in our Lot;
For who can ever show us what will come
After us, whether it be good or not."

(Ecclesiastes 3. 16-22. Burkitt's trans.)

"Who will show us any good?" Clearly not Ecclesiastes, for here surely we are "in the world, without God and without hope." Ecclesiastes denies there is any solution to the riddle of life, for he denies everything. Men debated long as to whether this book should enter the canon of the Old Testament but it was a wise instinct and providential guidance that permitted it to enter. It would be a pity if in a Bible that was intended for humanity the mood of skepticism had been unrepresented.

An interpretation that is unique in the Old Testament meets us in the fourth Servant Song. (See Isaiah 52.13 to 53.12.) Chronologically it should precede Ecclesiastes but logically it follows him. The opening verses set forth the current theology; "He was despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not." But the eye could not for ever cheat the conscience; they looked again and saw and asserted something new. Yes, they said, sin causes suffering, but it may be the sin of someone else that causes the suffering. It was *our* sin that caused

His suffering. "Surely he hath borne our sins, and our sicknesses he carried"; yet so foolish were we and ignorant that "we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." But now their eyes were opened and they saw a gospel hid in these sufferings: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our welfare was upon him and with his stripes we are healed."

That is something entirely novel and unique in the Old Testament; suffering, vicarious suffering has redemptive value. "Vicarious suffering is not a dogmatic but an experimental truth" (G. A. Smith). It is a truth that authenticates itself in life and experience; it vindicates itself to the conscience of men with a vindication that cannot be refuted. It matters little who the Servant is, whether the Figure is national or individual; He is unique in His reaction to suffering as His sufferings are seen to be unique in atoning power. For never before had the Old Testament seen men suffer in silence; in all cases either the voice of confession, "against thee, thee only have I sinned," or the voice of complaint as in the case of Job charging God with injustice. But here "he opened not his mouth." And so the Christian Church by a sound instinct felt the prophet was thinking long long thoughts and uttering more than he imagined. In Christ alone, as G. A. Smith points out, do we find this silence under suffering. No voice of doubt as to the Father's will but only glad acceptance; "in the volume of the book it is written of me, Lo, I come to do thy will." Nor any voice of guilt nor word of confession; no grievous burden on the conscience to wring from Him the cry of penitence and the word of confession. In this respect He stands alone, himself His own parallel, without a peer. He is unique and a nonesuch. The Church was wisely guided when it found Christ here for in Christ alone do we find vicarious suffering of redemptive avail in universal degree. "Some sufferers are Saviors" and now "we have rest by His sorrow and life by His death." This view sees meaning in pain and value in suffering, and the Lord of Life turns across the centuries to this very passage for the interpretation of His own passion.

We pass now to the New Testament where we find the view of the Servant and the Psalmist synthesized in the Pauline theology. Confining ourselves, however, to the view of the Psalmist and the aspect of the problem represented there, we find that what was implicit in the seventy-third psalm becomes clear and explicit in the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of the apostles. Let us repeat once more that there is no formal doctrine

of immortality in Old or New Testaments, but there is that which lies behind and beneath any doctrine of immortality. We take first the passage in Luke (Chapter 20) where certain Sadducees put a hypothetical case to Jesus to show the absurdity of the idea of Resurrection. Their intention is polemical and the question raised need not occupy us here; the answer of Jesus, however, is our concern. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." The meaning of that is clear; Abraham the Friend of God and Father of the Faithful is still His friend. Death did not, could not break that friendship. Abraham and Isaac and Jacob are not "has-beens"; the Syrian stars may look down on their graves but they look down on the Syrian stars. They are now in His presence and "serve him day and night in his temple."

That is the teaching of Jesus and its implications are obvious. Nor is it otherwise in the apostolic preaching, when they seek to interpret the Resurrection. Those disciples had all gone away after the burial and never believed to see Him any more; the dream had died and their hearts were full of despair. That is certainly the background of the Resurrection. It was all against hope and expectation. The language used is heavy as with the sound of clods falling on coffins; "we used to hope that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." (See Luke 24.21.) That pluperfect tense puts it all so far, far away; we have here the acme of disappointment and despair. Then suddenly something happens and the whole atmosphere is electric. The Gospels tell it in a stumbling incoherent way but the proof of the Resurrection is not found in the Gospels; it is found in the existence of the early Christian Church and its members leaping and dancing and praising God, so that the New Testament becomes "the most radiant hymn-book ever written." All theology here is fused to doxology. What does it mean? They ask and we ask and we hear the explanation, "It was not possible that he should be holden of death" (see Acts 2.24) is how Peter explains it and Paul does not differ when he writes "Death hath no more dominion over Him." (Romans 6. 9.) They are recalling the teaching of our Lord and thinking things through; they see now what He meant by that word about Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. They recall that radiant faith of His that with utter surrender cast itself on the love of the Father, that life that moved in absolute reciprocity with the Divine, so that it was "his

meat and drink to do the Father's will." They thought of that and they thought of the omnipotent love of God that was revealed in the days of His flesh; they thought these two facts together and they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. On the one side they realized now that omnipotent love could not know defeat; they were persuaded "that neither death nor life . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Nor on the other side could faith *like that* fail of its reward and crown; it had in itself the guarantee of immortality. God would be unworthy to be called the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob; God would be unworthy, let us say it reverently, to be called the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ if He would leave them in the lurch and disappoint their adoring trust and surrender. But "God is not ashamed to be called their God." (Hebrews 11. 16.) God meets such challenge and meets it with triumphant love. That means for us that they are basing the assurance of immortality on the nature of faith and the revealed character of God, which is precisely what Jesus did. It is the faint gleam that first appeared in the Old Testament now shining as a radiant certainty.

"He hath brought life and immortality to light," but again we may say the doctrine here is largely a truth of experience; it is not dogmatic but empirical. "The heart has reasons which the reason does not know" and we venture to think that when the doctrine is so grounded it will rest on twin pillars that may not be easily shaken.

One word more. The Old Testament horizon was limited, the New Testament horizon is unlimited. There was reason for the Old Testament view that it should have its heaven here and now; the New Testament could, however, see beyond the veil and life here became one with life hereafter. Suffering could therefore be evaluated differently. Suffering was now viewed "*sub specie eternitatis*" and a new theology was born. The sufferings of the present time were as nothing "compared to the glory that awaits to be revealed." Moreover, the way of the Cross became the pathway to the Crown, for if we share in the fellowship of His sufferings we shall also share in the fellowship of His glory. Now we can understand how adversity is the beatitude of the New Testament; "blessed are ye, when men persecute and revile you . . . rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven." (Matthew 5. 11, 12.) The Old Testament view and the New Testament view thus both rest on a belief in "the ultimate decency of things" and are both grounded in the eternal righteousness of God.

Prayer

A. MAUDE ROYDEN

SO much has been written on the subject of prayer that I need some defense for my effrontery in tackling it again. I find this defense—and it seems to me a very sufficient one—in my experience when I am asked to pray for some person or cause, or have myself asked for prayers. I find it, further, in the astounding contrast (which only the fact that we are so accustomed to it prevents from astounding us) between the promises made by our Lord to those who pray and the actual results our prayers obtain.

It is of course stupid to take isolated sayings and build up a theology upon them but, if one puts together all the recorded sayings of Jesus about the power of prayer, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that, when rightly offered, He held it to be little short of limitless. It is the author of the Fourth Gospel, who recorded as actual fact some of the most unacceptable of our Lord's mighty works—unacceptable, that is to say, in the sense that they are least to be explained or understood by us—and who knew the contents of the other Gospels, who affirmed of them that he who believed in the Lord Jesus should "do mightier works" than those.

It would seem likely that religious people would not ask very glibly for the prayers of others if they realized what prayer was or accepted what our Lord declared it to be. Yet I think that every "religious" person, and certainly every minister of the gospel, must often have been repelled by the extraordinary glibness with which people ask or rather demand their prayers. In many cases they do not seem to have a notion that they are asking for anything of great value or anything which costs much. On the other hand, my heart has often sunk at the expression evoked on the faces of churchgoing Christians when I ask for their prayers! For example, I gave a good deal of my time some years ago to preaching missions lasting several days in one place. I used to visit the place with a little band of helpers and always on the invitation of some local body. I stipulated that *all* the churches in that place should be invited to co-operate, and a meeting between these helpers and my little band was always the first event in the mission. I liked this to be so, not only because I wanted to meet those at whose request I was in the town but also because I wanted to entreat their prayers during the mission. (I had of course asked most earnestly that such prayers should be

offered for us before we arrived.) I used to tell them, roughly, what we proposed to do and then, as I have said, entreated them to hold us up by their prayers. A meeting for such intercession was arranged for every day, at the hour which we were told was the most convenient. The number of people who attended the reception at the beginning was always large: the number who attended the services for intercession was so small as to be almost negligible. Nor am I able to convince myself that much prayer was being offered for our work in private, for the blank expression which comes to the face of the average Christian when asked for prayer appeared so regularly that at last I could hardly bring myself to make the request.

In view of our Lord's teaching, how can we account for this? I believe it is largely due to the fact that many of us do not trouble to find out just what our Lord did promise with regard to prayer; what His own practice was; and why it is that our prayers seem so often to be unanswered. The contrast between those promises and that lack of answer is so discouraging that, without always saying, even to ourselves, that God has "let us down," we, almost without noticing it, abandon the habit of prayer.

I believe that this feeling of discouragement comes partly because we have not taken sufficient trouble to find out what our Lord really taught about prayer, but even more because so much of what we profess to think—or even do think—about the matter is radically insincere. As children, most of us are taught to pray for things that we do not really want. It is not easy to see how this can be avoided! To teach a child to pray that it may be a good child seems not only natural but inevitable. Nevertheless it frequently happens that a child has no particular interest in goodness and does not want to be good—as it understands being good. For my part, I cannot remember that I ever expected this prayer to be answered. I was certainly not a good child and the consensus of opinion all around me was that I was not good: I accepted it with fatalism and my prayers to be made good were insincere because hopeless as well as lukewarm.

After having been taught to pray for things that we do not want, many of us go on to accept as "answers" things for which we did not pray.

Again and again I have joined with others in prayer for (for example) the recovery of someone who was ill. When, in spite of our prayers, the person died, I have been assured that my prayer was answered "in a better sense." It may be true that it is better to die than to live though, if this is so,

it is hard to understand why the Almighty sent us here at all. Whether, however, it is better to live or to die, it is simply untrue to say that when you pray that a person may recover his physical health and he, on the contrary, dies, one's prayer has been answered in the better sense. If people really believed this they would never pray for the recovery of anyone; they would either not pray about the matter at all or would pray that the person might die. Either of these proceedings seems to me more honest than to pray that they should recover, and then say that their prayer is answered when recovery does not take place.¹

So great indeed is the perplexity created by this extraordinary way of accounting for "unanswered" prayer, that many people not only will not pray for a definite thing but will not even pray for a definite person! I was present a little while ago at a meeting for intercession at which the one who was to lead us in prayer was given, on a piece of paper, the names of those for whom our prayers were asked. She proceeded to direct our prayer in the form of a meditation rather than an intercession. I think we meditated on the power of God or the love of God or some truth of that nature, but if it had been a meditation service with no purpose of intercession, it would have been just the same. At last someone anxiously called the attention of the leader to the list of names by her side. She said that she had received them and that they were there. She offered no further explanation and we continued to meditate. We did not know the names of the people for whom our prayers were being offered, nor from what they were suffering, nor even how many they were. As I have said, if it had been a meditation and not an intercession it would have been exactly the same.

This *may* be the right way of offering intercessory prayer but, if it is, it is clear that we cannot take our Lord as an example. He has told us more than once that He prayed for people and He seems to have been very definite and individual indeed in His prayer. "Simon, Simon, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." And for His disciples in general—"I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil." For my part I think it is wiser and safer to accept the teaching and example of our Lord, and I greatly doubt the wisdom of an attempt to be more "spiritual" than He is.

¹ It is of course quite reasonable and quite sincere to refuse to pray for any definite purpose. There are cases in which one cannot help feeling that death is actually preferable to life; but since one hesitates to pray for death—or indeed is quite uncertain what is best—one can only lift up the sufferer to God and ask that all that is best for him may be brought about. This is quite a different matter.

For the same reason it does not seem to me good to abandon all prayer for material things. Our Lord did not, it is true, say very much about prayer but what He did say was very definite. "When ye pray say . . . give us this day our daily bread." If He was right, it is wrong to think that petition is childish—even petition for material things such as bread. It is not really quite honest to "spiritualize" the bread when there is no suggestion that it meant anything in our Lord's mouth other than actual material bread.

These matters must be interpreted not only by what Christ taught but by what He did. He fed the hungry and He healed the sick, and never on any single occasion is it reported of Him that He refused to do so on the ground that physical hunger did not matter or that sickness was an excellent spiritual discipline, a punishment, or a specially sanctified means of serving God. He did not say that, when our prayers failed to achieve these things, it was because they were answered in some better sense: He said quite bluntly that it was because of our lack of faith. I know very little indeed about prayer but it is my conviction that God, "from whom cometh every good and perfect gift" and "in whom is no variableness, neither shadow cast by turning," desires for us health and happiness and well-being just as much as we desire them for ourselves. His love and wisdom are however so great that if, through the failure of our own faith or that of other people (for we are so much more closely bound together than we realize), He cannot (not He *will* not) give us all that in words we ask, He nevertheless gives us what we are able to receive. A person who is not able for one cause or another to receive physical healing can be given grace to make of his sickness the means to some spiritual advance: and the inability to be healed physically is not by any means always his fault.

Anyone who knows anything of human nature must admit that what I have said about sickness is sometimes also true of sin. The fact that a person has fallen into a sin *may* be the means of his eventual recovery and salvation. No one will therefore argue that God wanted him to sin. All we can say is that the love and the power of God are such that, if and when we turn to Him in penitence and faith, offering our whole life to Him, He is able, not indeed to undo the irrevocable past, but to wring from it something which can be of service to ourselves and to others in the future. We do not, that is to say, ask that the sin we have sinned may be as though it had never been, for we know that that is not a thing possible to be done: we do ask, if we are wise,

that we may learn from it something that will make us better people and therefore more serviceable to others in the future. Understanding, humility, sympathy are gifts which may be derived from our own consciousness of past failure and our experience of the love of God in winning us back to life and giving us power to overcome. In the same way, all of us who have ever been ill have some experience of the grace in us of understanding and sympathy with all those who suffer: nothing that I urge in this article militates for an instant against that knowledge. We may all thank God that we have suffered. Nevertheless, if our Lord's teaching and example are to be taken as our guide, it is no more the will of God that we should be ill than that we should sin. We are not, when we ask for health either for ourselves or for others, to be in any doubt that health is what God wills for us. Never in any single case is it recorded that Jesus rejected the prayer of the sufferer on the ground that his suffering was the will of God. On the contrary, He went out of His way on more than one occasion to say that it was the work of the evil one. He spoke of a woman who had been ill for many years as one "whom Satan had bound," and it is clear from the context that He did not mean that she was a wicked woman. He simply meant that disease was the work of evil and not of God. In another place, we are told that He "could there do no mighty works"; not that He would not. The evangelist goes on—"save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them. And he marvelled at their unbelief." It is clear that Jesus would have healed if He could; the unfaith of the sufferer made healing impossible.

I emphasize this because our Lord taught us to offer our prayers "in His name" and, if we are to suppose, as we must, that this means that the prayer of a Christian should be offered in accordance with the will of God, it is clear that prayer for the recovery from illness is of this nature. Of other things there must be doubt, but how can there be doubt on this point? Yet, again and again, it is precisely this kind of prayer of which, when recovery does not follow, we are assured that recovery has indeed been given—only it was a spiritual recovery, not a physical one. I do not mean any irreverence if I say quite bluntly that, to me, this seems simply fraudulent. I find it much easier to believe—and in fact I do believe—that it was our faith that was insufficient. I believe indeed that this lack of faith is often due to the almost insurmountable obstacles offered to our prayers by the unfaith of the world in general. To what extent this general lack of faith inhibits our own indi-

vidual faith or the extent to which God is *able* to answer our prayer, no one can judge: yet for my own part, I do hesitate to claim that I have faith in the profound sense in which our Lord seems to have used the word.

When we consider that it is to the prayer of faith that Christ promised all things, and that faith to Him meant that He was actually able to thank God for the answer to His prayer which had not yet been given, we shall hesitate to claim for our unanswered prayers that they were offered "in perfect faith." How many of us can sincerely say—"Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me and I know that thou hearest me always," before the proof of that hearing has come? Our Lord did so and this is what He meant by faith. Yet, again and again, people have assured me that they prayed with perfect faith "although of course I knew that I should not get it!" This is literally true. And there are many shades of faithfulness between this grotesque attitude and that of our Lord at the graveside of Lazarus. It is, I believe, this basic insincerity about prayer that makes most of us unwilling to pray. We do not always realize why it is and we reproach ourselves for our reluctance; but it does not do us altogether discredit. We are right in not wishing to engage in a practice that is not real.

When however we have convinced ourselves that it is real and have found from experience its reality, there is yet another obstacle. It is that prayer often shows us that the way to the answer lies in a direction we are unwilling to take. In many cases, when we have felt that we must pray because prayer is "the only thing we can do" in this particular case, we find, not with delight but with alarm, that there is something that we can do, and that we have no inclination whatever to do it. I once met a man who was a healer and who had the greatest reluctance to be one. He told me that for a long time he had tried to persuade himself that the healing, which was a physical and not a spiritual gift (if one may make such a distinction), was a mere coincidence. Having often thought, myself, what a lovely thing it would be to be able to heal anyone, I stood amazed. Not for long, however. My friend went on to point out that, in view of the appalling amount of ill-health that there was in the world, anyone who could heal any kind of disease was certain to be inundated with claims of this kind. He had not contemplated such a life as now seemed inevitable. He had quite other ideas. He had already chosen his profession and was actually beginning his training. He did not want to be diverted from it and he saw at once that the two things were incompatible. How could he be glad he was a healer?

In the end, because he was indeed a religious man and had a most earnest desire to be what God desired him to be at all costs, he accepted his vocation and, though he still regards his gift as a "physical" power rather than a spiritual one, he exercises it in a truly religious spirit and it does, as he foresaw it would, claim all his energy and time.

There must be many prayers offered in the simple belief that we are ready to do whatever is needed for the answering of our prayers. There must be many more which are offered with unconscious or subconscious holding back. Just as, when we ask for guidance, we frequently affirm that we have not received it, when the truth is that we were refusing to look for it with our whole heart for fear it should lead us in a direction in which we had not strength to go. The pathetic thing is that, quite often, that direction is not the one in which God wishes us to go; but the fear that it may be so prevents our seeing clearly. When we have thus prevented ourselves from seeing clearly, we easily declare, with real but not quite real disappointment, that God has given us no guidance. We add that we are discouraged and see no object in continuing to pray: or we do not say this, but we act it.

"Not everyone that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven."

The sincerity demanded by our Lord in this saying is a most searching thing and, in regard to prayer, it seems to me that the whole subject has been deeply corrupted by insincerity. We pray for things we do not want, we pretend that our prayers have been answered when they have not been answered, we follow methods which we affirm to be more "spiritual" than those which our Lord Himself used. Even while we make the recitation of our Lord's Prayer a continual feature both of our private devotions and our public worship, we do not hesitate to set down as childish the very example that He set us. Jesus was often "found in prayer" by His disciples and, when they asked Him to teach them how to pray, He gave them a short lesson indeed. Yet, short as it is, it contains direct petition and petition not only for spiritual but for material gifts.

Rather than admit that we fail continually in meeting the conditions which make prayer (according to our Lord's teaching) full of power, we say that we have fulfilled the conditions; that God has not answered our prayer because of some other conditions quite different and not laid down by our Lord; and we have succeeded in weaving for ourselves such a web of sophistry that prayer in a direct and childlike spirit has become almost impossible.

The Preacher: A Creative Theologian

EDWIN E. AUBREY

HOW many times we hear the disclaimer, "I'm no theologian. I'm just a parson!" This is one of the most damaging statements that a minister of the gospel can make. Of course, we can all understand why he makes it. In mock modesty he wants us to know that he doesn't aspire to the rarefied heights of the religious stratosphere. Breathing is difficult there without special apparatus which furnishes us the necessary oxygen of spiritual life. If the lungs do become acclimated to the altitude, then he cannot breathe on the earth, where his work must be done. Theologizing, he feels, may destroy his effectiveness in the ministry, by distracting him from the actual scene of his pastoral labors. To reassure those who are concerned that he shall not become an impractical speculative thinker he shouts lustily, "Cheer up! I'm no theologian!"

Sometimes another note can be detected in this disclaimer. It is a note of warning. "Don't expect me to answer your questions that run off into philosophy or theology. I can give you plain advice regarding spiritual living; but I am not going to answer these questions about the ultimates—that is, not in analytical fashion. You take my word for it, but don't let us get involved in abstruse discussions of the ultimate destiny of man, or the nature of the persons in the Godhead, or the origins of human sin. We should just get lost in vagaries if I tried that." Having set these limits to his ministerial enterprise, he feels that he can really work with his parishioners in the immediate problems of their daily concern. He will help them to develop a closer fellowship through the agencies of the Church. He will be glad to talk with them about problems of business ethics or domestic harmony, or he will pray with the sick and give to the bereaved the consoling sympathy of a great heart. But he lays no claim to being a learned doctor, and he confesses ignorance of the fine points—and how fine they can be, like a split hair, sometimes—of theological erudition.

Now, why are honest disclaimers like these so damaging? Suppose we liken the minister to an applied scientist, and the theologian to a pure scientist. Then, is the engineer to be expected to know the structure of atoms so long as he can calculate stresses and strains on a steel truss? Must the

pharmacist know the processes of oxidation involved in the development of protoplasm? Need the agricultural expert know the origins of the solar system, or what differentiates plants from animal organisms? Why should a settlement worker be expected to know the nature of social organization among the Wyandotte Indians? The engineer has had a taste of atomic physics, the pharmacist of biology, the farming expert of geology, the social worker of ethnology, in their academic training; but need they, *can* they, keep up those theoretical interests?

But let us remember that the really expert engineer *does* concern himself with physics; the pharmacist with organic chemistry. The apparently theoretical researches of the chemist are replete with striking instances of crucial contributions to human welfare. Consider the case of insulin in the cure of diabetes. The basic processes on which the applied scientist relies are of greatest importance in the reliability of his work; and greater efficiency is perpetually being achieved by a return to fundamental principles. What a revolution radio has worked in modern communication, thanks to the work of physicists; and what importance does the General Electric Company attach to its theoretical experiments at the "House of Magic!" The attempt to separate theory from practice is treacherous: it divorces the researcher from the sources both of his problem and his needed information; and it cuts the practitioner off from the sources of his own advance.

Yet the preacher stands in a different relation to his task from those cited above. He does not merely run a church. He preaches a message. Furthermore, this message has a peculiar character among the various forms of propaganda. The religious teacher deals not only with the immediate concerns of life, but with the heights of expectation and the depths of confidence of the human beings committed to his charge. His message cannot stop with the middle distances. He cannot take for granted the foundations of men's lives—it is his business to examine them and, if need be, to secure radical reorientation. He cannot avoid theology.

What is the reason, then, for the false hiatus between preaching and theology? It is to be found largely in our theological seminaries. A student comes to the seminary for training. He has probably had some pastoral experience, or at any rate has done some preaching. Perhaps he has parish responsibilities to be carried along with his study. Now, there are two kinds of theological students. One kind has come to the theological school to secure a degree. He concentrates upon his courses, mastering their content

for regurgitation at the proper examination hour, and—if he is cautious—in the right classroom. He may even be a critical mind. In this event he is interested in the play of ideas within the scope of the course. He may conceivably be so critical that he compares the content of different courses, and, if he does not altogether lose courage, attempt to reconcile them in his own mind. In all this he deals with his theological concepts within the framework of an academic environment. He acquires the graduate student mind. He becomes one of the recognized “promising scholars” of the institution, a joy to his professors, and a despair to his fellow students. On the crest of this wave he sails through the seminary, only to discover that when he goes into a pastorate or turns to teaching undergraduates, all this thinking has to be done over in the light of its contact with the experience of his little flock.

The other variety carries the problems of a parish to the classroom. He may annoy his teachers by his perpetual request for light on some concrete parish problem. Indeed, so impatient may he become that he gives up in despair the expectation of any help from theological professors in the acute problems that he has to face. It is all so impractical. He rather pities the fusty academic mind that lives on desiccated theological vegetables and knows nothing of fresh spiritual food grown in the garden of the present age.

This picture is of course overdrawn. Yet within this cartoon we recognize figures far too common. It is not surprising that the preacher looks askance at theology. But let him beware of putting on blinders so that he can see nothing but the little ecclesiastical road straight before him; for out of the past come, by a path he had not seen, powerful characters he had supposed were dead. Calvin lays a hand on his shoulder as he reads Karl Barth or Reinhold Niebuhr. Even the strange Jacob Boehme, whom he had ignored as one of the lesser lights, reappears in the company of Berdyaev or Paul Tillich or an Anglo-Catholic colleague, having been introduced by the Russian novelist Dostoevski. Clothed in the black tunic of Stalin or in the robed radicalism of a Christian Socialist comes Karl Marx; while Feuerbach is found unexpectedly sitting in the office of a Freudian psychiatrist; and behind the shoulder of a Nazi brownshirt he sees the figures of Duns Scotus, Luther, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche—apostles, all of them, of the supremacy of the will over the intellect.

Where now is the gap between theology and contemporary life? The country storekeeper may not know Marx, but he knows “them damn Com-

munists," and expects the Church to be his bulwark against such atheism. The college student may know nothing of Feuerbach, but he thinks Freud has "the clue to this whole emotional business." There comes the steady tramp of Fascist feet carrying banners inscribed, "Down with the priesthood of all believers!" "A bas l'individualisme!" "Away with individual conscience!" Have these slogans nothing to do with theology? It is tragically true that with much academic theology they have little to do. Their devastating import is dismissed as irrelevant to the eternal gospel. Christians are commanded, with the preachers presenting arms again, to move in mass formation against "Secularism," knowing little of the enemy and caring less for the actual points of contact and recoil between the Christian faith and these vigorous rivals.

Meanwhile in a distraught social order, disorganized and confused men and women are asking for answers to questions about their basis of belief. Theirs is the same old search for stability, for some new outlook to give zest to life, for company in loneliness, for hope in the midst of failure, for some assurance of their own significance in a teeming world. Birth is still theirs to bring about and marvel at. Death marks their end—or is it so?—of life. And in between lie hunger, pain and joy, failure and sorrow. Unutterable dread and stranger exaltations demand to know their wherefore and their whence. Abiding human problems still confront us all: Peniel and Patmos, Tekoa and the Place of Skulls, the sands of bondage and the seas of deliverance, idyllic Eden and that other garden called Gethsemane, triumph at Carmel and tears in Babylon, a chariot of fire and a cross of wood. These things are a part of all men's lives, and as long as men are conscious of them, the ministers of religion will be assailed with questions that will not be put off. They cry out for answers and will accept no substitutes for thought.

The minister must somehow be a prophet and a priest, making men discontented with a vision and keeping them steady with a faith. But a vision is a mirage unless it has the substance of reality in it; and faith is credulity when knowledge has no part in it.

THE HISTORIC ROLE OF THEOLOGY

Theology is the meeting point of vision and insight. The bloodstained twisted yarn drawn from the stuff of the common life, and the golden thread finespun from stuff that dreams are made of are woven on the loom of hope. The warp and woof are drab realities and gleaming faith; and, like some

tapestry, the pattern of dogma, even while it marks its own date by quaint objects, holds us enthralled by the vigorous rhythm of its color and the magnificence of its conception. For theology arose from the joint parentage of caution and courage, and if a theologian appears hopelessly bound by caution to his own day, he also leaps beyond it through his faith.

Paul, the first great Christian theologian, was a missionary pastor, struggling to make intelligible to Hellenistic minds truths that he gained within the framework of Judaism; a sickly traveler roaming the empire; a pastor to such unpromising flocks as the quarrelsome, immoral crowd at Corinth. The ascetic Origen guarded the little flame of Christian idealism in his school, set in the midst of the metropolitan vice of Alexandria and preyed upon by Decian persecutions in which he suffered torture with his harassed band. Cyprian held his group in Carthage together while persecution swept over it, and, when the storm subsided, developed a conception of the Church that could cope with the dissolution of an empire. And when that empire fell, and the fires of Christian faith burned low, out of the very embers Aurelius Augustine could fan to flame a lofty faith that held the Church steady for half a millennium. An Augustinian monk, vicar of his order, preacher and patriot, Martin Luther gave a doctrine of freedom that ushered in democracy. When in the eighteenth century the deist God seemed lost in natural law, Bishop Butler of Durham steadied men's minds by showing that from the insights of scientific knowledge we can draw analogies for faith. And in a day of self-obsession with their own concerns, men heard from a German pastor, Schleiermacher, of man's absolute dependence on God, and in an age of individualism he preached the meaning of Christian fellowship.

Out of the stuff of human life theology is born—born in response to crucial questions. "Is there any meaning to it all?" men ask in hours of exhaustion and disillusionment; and the Christian leader answers with a faith in God, rationale of our universe, source of our ideals, strength of our sensitive weakness, consummator of the meanings of all our acts.

"Why speak of Jesus, long since dead and gone?" men querulously challenge us. And in our Christologies we try to make it plain how in His spirit God was manifest, how He survives the sepulcher they laid Him in, how men have known Him down the centuries as a living companion, how in His person are combined the forces of the world.

The question quickly follows: "How can man, this restless mortal marked by death and caught in the web of finitude, how can he rise up to

declare the meaning of the world and prate of the eternal?" Patiently then the Christian tries to show what man is made of; how he transcends himself because he carries a ladder with him in his conscience and his intellect; how, when man loses contact with his source his thinking goes astray but can be recalled by listening to the author of his destiny; how from the matrix of this natural world he rises to the stars and breaks the bonds of time.

"How comes it then that some men see these things, and some do not?" When this question is raised, the doctrine of revelation seeks to explain how knowledge is enlarged by consecration; how at the boundaries of human rational thought new lights are seen breaking into our darkness; how in the darkest hours of doubt our love of good and beauty may recover faith for us through conscience and the rhapsodies of life.

Out of the depths men cry perennially for something to redeem their wasted lives and set them on higher ground where they may see and feel the sun again. This is the longing which is met when preachers talk of salvation and the kingdom of God.

How forbidding sounds the list of doctrines in a book: anthropology, original sin, divine omnipotence, election, Christology, sanctification, revelation, angelology, transubstantiation, pre-existence of the soul, prevenient grace, synergism, eschatology, predestination—it is as dreary as sodden leaves in a November wood. "Words! Words!" we cry. "May whatsoever gods there be deliver us out of the hands of the theologians, for they fight with weapons that we do not understand, they storm objectives that we cannot see, and celebrate victories of which we have never heard!"

There lies the tragedy. Caught in the fatal fascination of their vocabularies these learned disputants become blind men. Their words were pointers, nothing more. For they speak of that which their words cannot encompass; but their loquacity, full of sound and fury, becomes for them the storm on Horeb, and they hide their faces—not from God but from the magnificence of their own phrases. Caught in this trap they then proceed to draw from the vocabulary a vast array of implicates and corollaries and deductions till the day dawn, while the shadows do not flee away. The result is the dreary wastes of secondhand theology, divorced from the living presence that awakened the mind to creative expression.

Living in the heart of religion is always a vital theology; but it knows its limitations. Its traffic is in figures of speech, analogies that point men on from the familiar heights and depths of life to that which lies beyond

our power of definition. God is like as a father pitying His children; He is the Eternal Judge separating the sheep from the goats; the Fountain from which flows the stream of life-giving power; the Great Designer of this vast cosmic mechanism; the Rock that gives shade in a barren land; the Circle that stands perfect and endless. Theology is closer to poetry than to the logical literalism of philosophy.

This is not to say that it is fantastic, that it contains no clear propositions. But the theological propositions have a clarity derived not from precise verbiage, but from luminous suggestion. Like the mystic who writes volumes to declare the ineffable; so the Christian leader must, he absolutely must, speak of that which he cannot encompass. Here is the art of preaching; it is drawing a line to denote a summit, and leaving open empty spaces, as in Chinese art, to lure the imagination to the infinite. How we do talk in the pulpit! We insist on cluttering up the background with the gewgaws of our silly little thoughts till God is shut out save for those whose imaginations are strong enough to transcend the chatter. Theology should be a chrysalis in which the human being clothes the faith that shall one day break forth in a flight to God. Too often it is the shell carried on a snail's back: at once a protection and a burden.

How can we recover this vitality in theology? How can the preacher become a creative theologian?

THEOLOGY AND PASTORAL CARE

Let us return to the layman with whose concerns we were dealing in the brief summary of historic doctrines of the Christian faith. This layman is a man whose intellectual activity is, like everyone else's, shot through with emotion. This emotion is the stuff of his Christian motivation. (The connection between emotion and motivation is not merely etymological, it is psychological.) As a believer he embodies not a bare concept, but a profound attitude, an organization of his emotional life around a given idea. Let us therefore beware, as the first step in understanding him, of assuming that when he repeats, in unison with other worshipers on Sunday morning, "I believe in God the Father Almighty," he is expressing the same religious conviction as his neighbor. Is his God the Father who, when his closest friends forsake him, will cherish him as a son? Is his God the Great Navigator of all things whose hand is on the wheel in this topsy-turvy world? Or is his God the wrathful Judge before whom his sins are as scarlet? Or is

He, perchance, the Leader into that kingdom which holds the promise of the agelong quest for justice and decency and freedom?

Who shall say unless he know the man? The meaning of Christian belief is found not in creedal symbols but in human lives. What a terrible responsibility this places upon the preacher who dares to speak in the same words to all these individual men and women in the pews before him! Religious conviction gains its strength from the emotions which are built into beliefs; it gains its validity from the degree to which those beliefs are consistent with the realities which we encounter in our world. The task of the preacher is concerned with both aspects of religious faith; with the soundness of its concepts and with the depth of its hold on the emotional life.

Two problems arise from concentration on one or other of these poles of the religious attitude. We have long been aware of the dangers of emotionalism where the preacher taps the deep springs of emotion with an ill-defined idea. People then "get religion" in a strange glow of sentimental excitement which is unproductive because it is not marshaled behind any constructive idea which can give direction to their lives. Every local minister knows the task bequeathed to him by the itinerant evangelist, the task of giving some definite content and purpose to the new convert's "commitment to Christ." Backsliders are numerous where this is not done, for the fervor aroused in the revival meetings may die away when the external conditions of the emotional experience (the tabernacle, the massed choirs, the flaming evangelist) are removed; unless some new and more permanent basis of religious loyalty is offered to them. Theirs is emotional arousal ("rousement," I believe the Negroes call it) without clear conceptual understanding of what the Christian faith means. And there are times when this emotional stimulation takes undesirable directions which are not so "religious." The frontier revivals in our American scene tell their own story.

It is not surprising that many, along with the Presbyterian "Anti-Revival Men" whose opposition led New Light ministers and Cumberland Presbyterians to withdraw from their Church, should regard such emotional revivalism as dangerous. Yet we have also erred at the other extreme of concentrating attention so much on accurate and precise ideas that emotional factors were neglected. The consequence of this has been a form of intellectual assent devoid of power. Respectable ideas are held in relative detachment. Vigorous conviction is lacking. The believer is flaccid and feeble in his religious life. Here is the weak point of liberalism for which it has been

mistakenly condemned wholesale. Here the line of sound action and belief is delineated but little or no "drive" is developed behind it.

It is the task of the Christian minister to see that emotional power is built into intelligent belief among his flock, so that there is a well-rounded attitude of devotion to the ideals and the realities of Christian faith. How can this be done?

First of all, the risks of superficial theological criticism must be appreciated. To attack the faith of a devotee is to break down an organization of his emotional life. This emotional disorganization may have disastrous consequences. The emotions, being now disconnected from religious ideas, may be quickly reorganized about the destructive critic or his views. Tom Paine or Nietzsche or Freud may become the substitute for Jesus; or atheism and social radicalism (the two are by no means synonymous) may be pursued with all the ardor formerly reserved for dogmatic belief. Every college faculty presents at least one sample of unintelligent anti-Christian fervor. Even where an intelligent substitute interpretation of Christian belief is offered, it may miss the mark because it overlooks the emotional needs which were met in the old faith. To offer for an old theology which gave a man a sense of security a new theology which calls a man to high adventure, may destroy the sense of security without capturing him for the adventure. We must understand the emotional outreachings of his belief and give them sounder orientation in our substitute ideas.

When this is not done the convert may change his mind but his heart remains attached to his first love. In an emergency or under stress of emotional difficulty he may well relapse into the earlier faith. I recall the story of a missionary of fundamentalist background who under a radical teacher became a full-fledged Humanist. Returning to the foreign field, disturbed by homesickness and by the conflict sure to be encountered with his erstwhile colleagues, he fell in with a Roman Catholic priest on the voyage and by the time they landed had embraced that faith so redolent of all the authoritarian security and the clear doctrinal formulation of his earlier conviction. I encountered the reverse of this when a student who had been a Roman priest came to talk with me about his recent decision to join the Unitarian Church. I felt it my duty to explore with him the emotional ties that bound him to his earlier faith, and to warn him not to become a Protestant too fast. The annals of religious experience are full of sudden conversions followed at some later time of emotional stress by equally startling returns to earlier faiths.

Often this return is the very thing which saves the mental stability of an individual; where the alternative is chaotic emotional collapse. Everyone who changes the mind of a deeply religious person has the moral responsibility to see that the emotional reorganization is also achieved. Otherwise the latter end of that person may be worse than the first: seven devils in exchange for one. To conserve the intellectual gains of faith it is necessary to see that the emotional factors are reoriented.

Let us look more closely at these emotional aspects of faith. They come sometimes by transfer from a person to whom the believer has been attached and whose theology he has taken over. The old-time religion that was good enough for father is good enough for him. While this is a precarious basis for emotional adjustment, it must be taken as the starting point. It is precarious because severance of the bond of personal relationship to such a paternal or other exemplar of faith by death or by estrangement may threaten a faith which is intrinsically sound. (After all, even parents are sometimes right!)

Often the religious belief is part and parcel of a rewarding fellowship, and the theological conception is really a banner phrase around which the group had rallied. Then separation from the group may weaken the faith, and conversely, loss of faith in the idea may break down a fellowship which has been built deep into the structure of a believer's personality. For still others the concept has stood as symbol of a triumph over some crisis: in a time of terrific disillusionment about an honored friend the sense of an abiding Christ has steadied some man. When all went gray with fear trust in God gave to another sanity. These beliefs thus gather around themselves all the emotional aura of these triumphs, sometimes exhilarating, sometimes calm. Horace Bridges tells of an afternoon in his boyhood when, he recalls, some cloud hung low over the home:

"There was great trouble in the family, of the sort that strikes a child as all the more portentous and disastrous because he cannot clearly understand it, and this vague sorrow was heavy upon me. . . . It must have been a summer day; and suddenly I lifted my sad eyes toward the western sky. One of those miraculous sunsets that are occasionally seen through the smoky haze of London was in all its glory. Instantly my trouble fell from me. The universe spoke to me. It said, 'Don't worry. Underneath are the everlasting arms.' And I believed it, and have never doubted it since, and never can doubt it. Because I am sure of that, I can doubt and have doubted everything else."

Whatever be the merits of his conception, clearly it is built into the central

structure of his life. And he stands in a great company of people with faith born of similar experiences.

To know the intimate personal character of a man's faith, to be able to clarify the emotional need which it fulfills, to see the fulfillment of this need in terms of a world which is growing and of which he may be only dimly aware, and thus to prepare him to live emotionally as well as intellectually in that world by enlarging and redefining the area of emotional expression, to help him formulate the view of life which is for him both true to the most we know and stimulating to his deepest self—this is the pastor's job in theology. Here counseling and doctrine meet.

But they meet at another point as well. We have tried to show how prominent a place is played in theology by vivid analogies. The very vividness of the analogies is derived from these areas of emotional expression. Such analogies are drawn from the storehouse of human suffering and joy: a father longing to see his prodigal son, a husband seeking his unfaithful wife, an unsuccessful tenant-farmer rendering account to his landlord, a merchant putting all his savings into a pearl of great price, a shepherd calling his individual sheep by name, a child pouting in the group at play, a runner keeping his top pace without looking back, a man nearly drowned in the flood, a house founded upon a rock. These are the points of contact with the emotional quality of religious faith. These examples, these parables recall not merely word pictures but experiences fraught with meaning in the hearts of the hearers. One figure strikes home vividly to the man who has almost drowned; and the agony of those agelong moments when blackness threatened ere the saving arm of some rescuer was felt on his numb shoulder, the slow struggle out of a losing consciousness to regain his sensibilities—all this is revived in the heart of the man who can understand those words of the sixty-ninth Psalm: "I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me. I am weary with my crying, my throat is dried; mine eyes fail while I wait for my God. . . . My prayer is unto Thee, O Jehovah . . . let me not sink, let not the water flood overwhelm me, neither let the deep swallow me up." It may be that another figure will open the heart of the man who knows all that it meant of anxiety and of thrill to invest his whole fortune, his very life, in a single enterprise; for him is the tale of the pearl of great price, and the cautious investor will never really grasp it.

To find the right figure, the richly suggestive analogy, to point men toward the meaning of God: that is the preacher's task—and he cannot do

it unless he is both a pastor and a theologian as well. "A pastor, yes," you say, "but why a theologian?" Because the analogies must carry their modicum of literal truth about God or Christ or sin or salvation. The preacher-pastor must know to what it is that he would point men, or to whom. When he does this he reaches down into men's deepest feelings to lift them up; he captures for religion the hearts from which are the issues of life; he both strengthens the religious fellowship by making it a meeting place of souls and he guides into clearer light the vague, dark yearnings of the men and women whom he is ordained to serve.

THE CREATIVE ROLE OF THE PREACHER IN THEOLOGY

In this view of religious belief as bipolar we have the clue to the creative role of the preacher in theology. The conditions of a creative theology lie in two directions: in the hearts of men, and in the objective facts of the outer world. A creative theology must operate in both spheres. By a creative theology I mean one which frees itself from dead shackles of the past—because life must move on and "God has still more light to break forth from His word." In this sense a creative theology is distinguished from one which is merely traditional: it uses the accumulated experience as a springboard into the future, it adds to the insights handed down to us some little increment of clearer understanding, it even infuses the body of Christian faith with a new power through vital connection with the evermoving stream of human life; it uses unprecedented contacts in cultural life to enrich the common store of spiritual treasure of the race.

At the same time theology is not creative merely by virtue of novelty. It is creative also as a factor in human life. It opens up the human heart to higher reaches of life. It draws the individual into the stream of Christian tradition both to reinforce him by the holy company of the apostles, saints, and martyrs of the past and to challenge him to create new values for that fellowship out of his own individual experience and perspective. It brings to pass new incidents of Christian history by stirring men to action through their faith and their dreams. It is a maker of souls among the spiritual derelicts who take their bearings by its light and rig their sails again to catch the breezes that blow across the centuries from Christ.

Now, it is clear that the minister stands in a favored place among the theologians because he is so close to human spiritual need. He may destroy his passport to the human heart. When I was in seminary we talked of pas-

toral calling as "bell-pulling"—a tragic commentary on our lack of grasp of the elements of preaching. To pull a bell and then engage in some bromidic small talk with parishioners may be polite, but surely it is not pastoral. The tactful winning of confidence so that people trust you for an honest man and a friend with special spiritual resources—this is the beginning of pastoral work. Its end is found in that great phrase of Paul's, "Ye have taken me into your hearts." That pastor who knows his flock knows the analogies that will lend vividness to the elusive spiritual realities of which he speaks. Out of the depths of their experience he draws the inspiration for his sermons, and in them live again the great profundities of all ages. Only when he knows men and women in their stark unspoken terrors and their inward exaltations does he really see the meaning of the great theological problems.

Through them he makes his concrete contact with the wider world, and in their responses to its pressures he catches his glimpses of the spiritual import of the age. This is the material for his sermons. This is the area with which theology has always tried to deal. He can be a creative theologian if he will.

What are his resources for this task? Surely he does not work *de novo*; and his little life is not the source of wisdom for the world. But still the first resource is found in his own life. The Pietists insisted that no professor should occupy a chair of theology who had not himself been converted. This is rather hard on us, but it is sound. For no one can render his best service to theology who has not made a deep and honest commitment of himself to God . . . I speak no idle pieties, and I speak in deepest humility. The truth is this: that the facts with which theology deals are perceptible only to a chastened mind. The discipline is one of devotion: to eschew personal pride and seek the truth in humility; to set aside irritation and prejudice and to give oneself to sympathetic understanding; to prize fidelity to the experience of the ages more than mere novelty; to wait before closed doors of mystery rather than to turn away from them in denial; to subordinate the polemical spirit to the search for fellowship with those whose perspective is different from ours; to hold one's faith in trust, investing it in life and reinvesting it as God demands; and always to remember that the theologian speaks as a responsible leader in the Christian movement, and from within its institutions does he proclaim his message.

It is this very movement, often slow-moving and cumbersome, that brings to him its strength as well as its load. For in a study of the depths of

Christian experience he can find the prototypes of many a twentieth-century man, and living in the lives of the saints and their common Master he can catch the vision of that Holy Grail which is their quest and the informing power of their long career. In that great tradition he finds, too, the foundations of the Christian faith that they have found. Seen in their vital setting they become the growing pains of a faith struggling to maturity. The living faith of the dead sustains him, and he can prevent it from becoming a dead faith of the living.

At the same time, he must be alert to the human struggles of his own day. He must have an eye keen to see the inward meaning of the throes of social strife and vaunting ambition and blind prejudice within our social order. He must keep his ear attentive to the cry of the modern in search of a soul expressed in literature and art. Even the popular phrases bring their own revelations of the trends of thought: the skepticism of an "Oh, yeah?" or the curious humility of "Aren't we all?" or the challenging realism of "So what?"

But when the preacher deals with human problems let him not be a babe in the understanding of the technical problems involved in human adjustment today. This is a moot point: Barth pokes the finger of ridicule at preachers who pose as village sages, pronouncing on all the problems of the day. We cannot be experts on all things. In the attempt we shall become jacks of all trades and fail in mastery of our own. But let us avoid stupidity. An industrial girl went to a minister for help because she had been out of a job so long that invitations to "make easy money" were looking increasingly attractive, and she wanted his help. He told her that her unemployment was a punishment dealt out to her for sin; and she went out to—God knows what. Another minister lectures a parishioner on the sins of meanness, when his irritability is due to oversecretion of the thyroid gland. One blandly dispatches capitalism with a ten-minute paragraph. Another coins a clever epigram to send Freud, Jung and Adler scuttling to their holes. The pastor should know enough to know his own limitations in those fields, to see the points at which they touch the Christian faith and when to send an inquirer to the right expert, to detect a grave psychosis and yet to see the philosophic drift of a psychiatrist into whose hands he commends another's spirit.

Out of the fusion of his own deep devotion to his flock and his wide-ranging knowledge of the Christian faith he can fashion a theology that is a creative advance in the tradition and a creative force in the hearts of men.

Here then he stands in the pulpit. Behind him on the altar is a cross, symbol of all the riches of that historic movement which has held it high, and symbol too of that great sacrifice which was and is the inner power of Christian life. On the pulpit is a book—a book which speaks in changing accents one abiding truth: that there is a power that undergirds the right and holds the present day in trust for future good. Upon that book may rest some notes: notes of his studies and his own experience too. Before him sit expectantly a group of men and women, young and old, rich and poor, at peace or in mental torment—waiting for words that he shall speak. Perchance the group are strangers and he must speak in terms drawn from the common fund of human life. If he be a pastor to this flock, then are they deeper in the thought of this day's sermon. Beyond the doors there waits a world to which these pews disgorge their human load; a world of hope for some and dread despair for others, to all a world where life is cast in decision day by day. That world cares not that he is speaking; but he carries its woes, its perilous temptations and its joys within his heart.

What shall he speak? Surely no subtle web of dialectic taken bodily from a book. Scarcely amusing anecdotes that while away the hour. For this is an hour of worship, and the angel wings are close and hearts are opened by the spell of prayer. These souls are ready to be touched by God if this man can find a way. They go again within the hour, and now they hope for power to face the world and do their duty well. Perhaps they hope that ere the time is gone some gleaming light from God may change their lives and make them clean again. He speaks to such as these; he speaks in faith where knowledge cannot tread; he speaks in terms of knowledge too for there is here the knowledge of a world God made, a Church He made to serve it, and a God who maketh all things new through Jesus Christ. Let this preacher then take courage, for the words that he speaks are not of himself alone, and their power is found wherever he can find the meeting-point of human need with the strength that comes summoned from the far places of the world to see us through.

Nicholas Berdyaev

PAUL TILlich

I

AS I met Nicholas Berdyaev last summer in his old house in Clamart, a nice suburb of Paris, and discussed with him the European situation, I did not know that I would be asked very soon to write about him. So I did not use the occasion for asking him intensively about his background and his development. But the personal impression he gave me was as strong as it was fifteen years ago when he first came from Russia to Berlin as an exile, with all signs of the heavy hardships he had suffered in his country. After a short time of teaching in the Russian academy for philosophy of religion in Berlin he went to Paris with the academy and has since been teaching there. More than through his teaching he has become important through his books, which have appeared in German, French and English in the last decade and which have made him one of the outstanding and most representative religious thinkers in present Europe. He represents the creative religious thought on the basis of Greek-Orthodox traditions in a continent which is shaken by one catastrophe after the other and which, after a period of chaos and self-destruction, seems to be doomed to a transformation of a most radical character. In such a situation, especially when it is experienced by personal fate, religious thought goes beyond the limitation of merely theological problems and seeks a religious solution for the needs of a disintegrated world. First of all the question for the meaning of historical existence and thus for a philosophy of history generally becomes urgent. The new philosophy of history is a child of the World War and of the subsequent revolutions and catastrophes. It is not a product of theoretical considerations in a scientific detachment from history, but it is the work of men who wrestled with the puzzles of their own fate as emigres, driven from country to country, when they wrestled with the puzzles of our period and of history generally. This makes their attempts at interpreting history a matter of self-expression of personalities, groups and—if it reaches philosophical objectivity—of our whole period. It shows that our problem, more than any problem else, is the question for our historical existence.

But this question can be answered only on the basis of universal interpretation of human existence. Consequently the next question, not only in Berdyaev but in all of those who dealt with the same problem in a similar situation, was the question of the nature and existence of man. The doctrine of history drove us—I include myself in this group—to the doctrine of man. Man has history; therefore the interpretation of history depends on the interpretation of man. It is obvious that the picture of man, sketched by people like Berdyaev, must be quite different from the optimistic idealism of prewar theology. It reveals the tragic character of human existence which was forgotten in a period of scientific and economic progress and which became frightfully manifest in the last two decades. It shows on the other hand the eternal divine dignity of man as he essentially and eternally is in God. Human existence is to a great extent cultural existence, creativity in all realms of human possibilities. A new interpretation of history and man necessarily leads to a new interpretation of human cultural creativity, its meaning and its limitations. Berdyaev has given an especially powerful analysis of human creativity, the central category of his philosophy of culture. But he has done it in a way which fits into his doctrine of man and history: a creativity which can be divine as well as demonic and which needs, consequently, salvation. The stage of cultural development we have reached today shows impressively the self-destructive tendency of autonomous culture. Here the philosophy of religion appears as the ultimate basis of all of Berdyaev's ideas. It is not quite exact, to call it "philosophy of religion," so far as this word means a dealing with religion from a standpoint outside the concrete religion. On the other hand, it is not theology, so far as theology means the traditional explanation of church dogmas. Berdyaev calls it "theosophy," that is, a free development of church doctrines in terms of speculative metaphysics and mystical intuition. This type of thinking can be considered as the special and most precious contribution of the Greek Church to present religious thought. Berdyaev himself received it from the great religious thinkers of nineteenth-century Russia, first of all from Soloviov, his teacher.

II

Starting with this part of Berdyaev's doctrine, we have to ask for the main ideas of his "theosophy." He develops them mainly in his book, *Die Philosophie des freien Geistes* (The philosophy of the free spirit), with the

subtitle, "Problems and Defense of Christianity." In the chapter on "Theosophy and Gnosis" Berdyaev complains that the modern theosophical movements have distorted the great word theosophy and have obscured the old Christian theosophy and gnosis. "The mystical, not the scholastic theology always has been the true theosophy. Theosophy is any intuition which combines philosophy and religion" (311). Theosophy is esoteric in the sense that nobody can understand it who has not the mystical experiences on which it is based. In difference from modern theosophy and anthroposophy which have accepted the evolutionist idea of a development beyond man toward "superman," Christian theosophy has its center in the idea of the eternal God-Man. Man is more than a simple creature; he is the "otherness" of God. The second hypostasis in the Trinity is man who is born in eternity. Therefore man is more than a part of the cosmos since the whole cosmos in principle is included in man (317). He can meet God face to face and can have gnosis of the deep things in God. The lack of such a gnosis in the Western churches has given rise not only to the distorted recent theosophy but also to the modern rational interpretation of God, man and the world, which first has replaced the mystical knowledge and then has become the main foe of Christianity and religion. This situation must be overcome; for "times are coming when the neutral science will be impossible, when science either will be Christian or black magic" (339). Christian gnosis is based on the "reason of Christ," that is, on a reason which is divine and human at the same time. Berdyaev makes it quite clear that the center of his theosophy is the idea of the God-Man. Every philosophical and theological speculation should begin with the God-Man, because beginning either with God or with man maintains the cleavage between God and man. But "in Christianity the humanity of God is revealed . . . God without man, the inhuman God would be Satan" (223). This implies that an eternal relation of God to man exists. In order to explain this Berdyaev refers to Meister Eckehart, Jacob Boehme (who has a tremendous influence on Berdyaev), and Angelus Silesius, mystics who distinguish God and the divine abyss and stabilize a mutual dependence of God and man: "God is when man is; when man disappears God also will disappear" (228). The creator is begotten with the creation; God comes to existence as God simultaneously with man. Therefore God eternally is in motion. The immutability of God is a philosophical abstraction which denies the living God. Divine life is at the same time theogonic and cosmogonic, especially anthro-

pogonic, becoming. Consequently suffering belongs to God: "Christianity is a religion of the suffering God" (226). A merely transcendent God who realizes His will contradicts the tragedy of existence in which God Himself is involved.

Berdyayev knows that these ideas are dangerous because they can be understood in objective, metaphysical terms. But this would distort their meaning: "Only the mythological-symbolic description of the relation between God and man gives us the approach to this divine mystery" (224). "Symbol" is the expression for the fact, that the natural world has no meaning in itself. It is meaningful only as a symbol of another, the spiritual world. Symbol is the bridge between two worlds. "This realistic symbolism must be distinguished from the subjective or idealistic symbolism as well as from objective or naive realism. The former expresses the cleavage of the two worlds and the solitude of the modern man. The latter expresses the subjection to the embodiment of the spiritual in institutions, powers, matter and so-called facts. The former attitude does not know the incarnation of the Spirit, the latter loses the Spirit in its incarnation. Realistic symbolism as the method of Christian theosophy leads beyond this contrast, it leads to a new understanding of the "mythos." "Living knowledge is mythological . . . myth is reality, indeed, incomparably more reality than concept . . . myth expresses the supranatural within the natural . . . , the spiritual life within the life of the flesh" (89). The basis of Christian theosophy is the greatest and most central myth, the myth of the Fall, the Saviour and the Salvation. But nobody can approach the spiritual reality expressed in this myth who has not experienced the breakdown of his natural thinking and the transition from concept to symbol and myth.

The meaning of all these statements becomes very obvious when Berdyayev with abhorrence cites the Vaticanic decision reading: "Anathema to everybody who says that the one and true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be recognized with certainty by the natural light of human reason." This rationalism is opposed to any gnosis, it is "agnosticism" with respect to the divine mystery. The Thomistic and humanistic rationalization of Christianity are considered as the basis of its present crisis and of the rise of antichristian secularism. The Greek Church still has prerationalistic theosophic traditions, which may provide a new start in Christian thought and first of all a radical transformation of human feeling and consciousness.

From the Protestant point of view Berdyayev's theosophy seems to un-

derestimate the break between divine and human consciousness, thus opening the way to uncontrolled speculations and dangerous ecstasies. From the humanistic point of view he seems to neglect too much the creative character of the natural and its empirical forms and structures for the sake of emphasizing their symbolic transparence. In both respects his ideas must be transformed in order to become acceptable for present Protestantism. But the substance of his philosophy of religion must be maintained even when leading to a post-Protestant era of Christianity and to a more ecumenical East-West theology.

Berdyaev himself is not opposed to transformations of Christian thoughts. He stresses the dynamic character of the spiritual life and of the development of Church and mankind. "Christianity is messianic and eschatological, that is, dynamic, progressive . . . a movement toward an end . . ." (349). Therefore history and revelation will have periods in future as they have had in the past. Ecclesiastical and orthodox conservatism must be overcome since the human soul is always changing. "The old style of Christianity does not agree with the structure of the contemporaneous soul" (369); "the prevailing Christian consciousness seems not to have realized what has happened in the world; it has remained behind the events for some centuries. Christian apologetics are so out of time that they only can . . . prevent the return to Christianity" (368). Creative modernism on the basis of the eternal truth of Christianity is demanded . . . a point in which Berdyaev is in full agreement with many tendencies of modern and even humanist Protestantism and in full contrast to Barthian Biblicism.

All this presupposes a doctrine of the Church in mystical and cosmological terms. "The Church is everything, the abundance of being, the fullness of the life of the world and of mankind, in the stage of Christianization and grace . . . the Church is the Christianized cosmos" (379). As such the Church is beauty; and "beauty will save the world." Man becomes completely actual only in God-Man-hood, that is, in the Church (391). This is valid for creative men like Shakespeare, Goethe, Nietzsche, even when they fought against the churches. "In the Church flourishes the beauty of the cosmic life" (391). The consequence of this idea of interpretation of history in cultural life is obvious. The idea itself is understandable only through the doctrine that God-Man-hood is a fulfillment of man in every respect, also in his cultural creativity, and that the invisible Church is the realization of the God-Man-hood which has appeared in Christ. In this

way Berdyaev tries to overcome the cleavage between God and man, the Church and the world, religion and culture, and to transform the idea of individual Salvation into the conception of a cosmic Salvation, thus excluding the demonic doctrine of a dual Predestination.

III

The center of Berdyaev's theosophy is the doctrine of the eternal God-Man-hood. This leads him to an extensive doctrine of man, which is developed in all his writings, first of all in the *Bestimmung des Menschen* (the destiny of man). Berdyaev has learned in this respect from Jacob Boehme, Schelling, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Dostojewski, Scheler, Freud, Proust, all of them being in opposition to the typical Cartesian anthropology which still controls the official philosophy and psychology. The contradictory character of man having in himself the highest heaven and the deepest hell (Schelling) is acknowledged by all these men although from quite different points of view. "The paradoxical and contrasting nature of man is finally conditioned by his being at the same time a child of God and a child of the 'Nothing' . . . his roots are in heaven, in God and at the same time in the 'abyss of below' " (69). The idea of the God-Man is the center of Christian anthropology. This idea alone makes understandable human dignity and human tragedy. Neither Thomism nor Barthianism nor Humanism lead to such an understanding. They all void the paradox either in negating the divine or the abysmal element or both of them. But the mystery of man is the mystery of God: the uncreated freedom, the "Ungrund," the non-being which precedes the being out of which creator and creature are born. Without such a principle neither the irrational ground of nature nor human sin can be conceived, as Boehme has shown and modern vitalistic philosophy as well as the rediscovery of the unconscious have confirmed.

The doctrine of man is a doctrine of personality. Berdyaev calls himself personalist. His opposition against Marxism is first of all rooted in the collectivistic attitude he finds especially in Russian Marxism. Personality must be distinguished from individuality. "Individuality is a naturalistic-biological category, personality is a religious-spiritual category." Modern individualism is the opposite of the idea of personality. Therefore it can easily go over into collectivism. Personality, on the other hand, is a totality in itself which has unconditioned value and is related to superpersonal values. There may be very outstanding individuals who are not personalities because

they have no relation to suprapersonal values. Personality is rooted in spirit; therefore it cannot be explained in biological or sociological or psychological terms. "Personality does not participate in the fate of the genus, personality is immortal." The individual is mortal. Man is individual as well as personality, he is biological as well as spiritual, mortal as well as immortal.

In order to become personality man must emerge from his bondage to tribal life and tribal mythology. Only Christianity is able to free personalities from the control of the cosmic powers, embodied in the power of the tribe. Modern movements like nationalism and Communism try to return to this prepersonal stage of man. Personality needs personality. Even God is personality not as the absolute, the unconditioned and the abyss, but as love and sacrifice, as having a "Thou." This is expressed in the doctrine of Trinity which must be considered as the background for every doctrine of human personality. Berdyaev escapes the abstract theistic personalism which makes the idea of God self-contradictory, by distinguishing the absolute from the personalistic element in God, a way of thought which may lead to new doctrines of God and of man, opposed to Aristotle, Thomas and Descartes.

I may still point to the doctrine of the unconscious which Berdyaev accepts from psychoanalysis and with which he attacks the "dictatorship of the consciousness" in the post-Cartesian development. I may point farther to his solution of the sex problem whereby he uses the old theosophical idea of the androgynous character of the original man. The man in existence is deprived of his genuine virginity and therefore is in desire and hate between the sexes; Eros and death have become allies. In Christ the virginity in the sense of androgyny is restituted. These ideas are very important for a new foundation of Christian ethics on a deeper basis than orthodox supernaturalism, moralistic idealism and naturalistic pragmatism can provide.

An idea especially characteristic of Berdyaev is his notion of creativity. His whole book, *Der Sinn des Schaffens* (the meaning of creativity), is dedicated to this concept and explains its significance for the interpretation of man and culture from the religious point of view. "Being creature is being creative" (131). This idea is carried through in all realms of human activities. Finally it leads to a periodization of the history of revelation: The revelation of law (Father), the revelation of Salvation (Son), the revelation of creativity (Spirit). The present situation indicates the transition from the

second to the third period. Autonomous culture has come to a catastrophe. "Culture in all its forms has become a failure of creativity" (346). But it is "a sacred" failure and leads to a higher level, to the period of religious creativity in which neither obedience and law nor cross and sacrifice are decisive, but the creative Spirit and the face of Christ in power and glory. These ideas which Berdyaev later has moderated seem to be very important for modern Protestantism in its cleavage between the humanistic trend which emphasizes secular creativity in religious terms and the supranaturalistic trend which denies the religious meaning of human creativity completely.

IV

This leads finally to Berdyaev's interpretation of history. It is explained in his earlier book, *Der Sinn der Geschichte* (the meaning of history), and completed by two smaller books *Das Schicksal des Menschen in unserer Zeit* (the fate of man in our period) and *The End of Our Time*. Berdyaev's interpretation of history is influenced by two great streams of thought: the theological criticism of Western culture by the Russian writers of the nineteenth century; and the social criticism of the bourgeois society by Marx. But the decisive impulse came from the historical events since the World War. "Indeed, what happens in our days is more profound and more tremendous than usually is felt: a judgment is going on—not over a special historical period but over history itself" (*Das Schicksal*, p. 7). We live in an apocalyptic time, that is, in a time in which eternity breaks into time.

History is tragedy because man must live in history, but history is not concerned about man. It suppresses and destroys man since all historical objectivations, especially the states, are impersonal. This is valid first of all in our days in which man is grasped by immense collectives and must subject himself to their inhuman command. Economy has used man as a tool for the inhuman economic process. "The World War was the catastrophical increase and a revelation of the chaotic powers which live under the surface of capitalistic civilization" (15). This judgment over history is at the same time a judgment over historical Christianity. Neither Christianity nor Humanism were able to prevent the dehumanization and bestialization of mankind which goes on in the totalitarian states, first of all as nationalism and racism. The demons of the World War are still living and destroy the dignity of man. Berdyaev shows the process of dehumanization in the different realms of culture, including theology: "The doctrine of Karl Barth

and the dialectical theology mean a dehumanization of Christianity" (30). From this point of view Berdyaev describes the self-destruction of liberalism, the idolatry of nationalism, the tyranny of Caesarism, the idiocracy of the totalitarian movements, Fascist as well as Communist. All this can be overcome only by a power which is able to conquer the demonry and insanity of present mankind. This power is a new Christian spirit: "Christianity again will become the only and ultimate refuge for man." It is natural that from this point of view the idea of progress is refuted. Progress is called "idolatry to coming generations" in which the meaning of history is supposed to be fulfilled. Instead of this utopian illusion the apocalyptic idea of the end of history must be pronounced: the fulfillment of history is the end of history.

Many other productive ideas of Berdyaev could have been mentioned. The mentioned ideas may be sufficient to show the extreme richness, depth and creativity of the great Russian thinker and his significance for our present situation. They may further prove the necessity that a coming ecumenical theology consider the possible contributions of the Eastern Church more seriously than before. Modern Protestantism is not able to create the next period of Christian history without the help of the older churches. This means—since the contrareformatoric Catholicism is too much opposed to Protestantism—without the help of Greek-Orthodox traditions. Such a help can come obviously not from any kind of dogmatic orthodoxy but only from a free creative interpretation of the older traditions as we have found it in Nicholas Berdyaev.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Der Sinn des Schaffens*, 1927.
Der Sinn der Geschichte (Translated: The meaning of history), 1925.
Die Weltanschauung Dostojewski's, 1925.
Die Philosophie des freien Geistes, 1933.
Das Schicksal des Menschen in unserer Zeit, 1935.
Von der Bestimmung des Menschen (Translated in French and English), 1935.
Christentum und Klassenkampf, 1936.

Stained Glass

JAMES SHELDON

THE philosopher observes that words are signs of natural facts; that particular natural facts represent particular spiritual facts; that Nature is the symbol of Spirit. Thus a strong man is a lion; a cunning man is a fox; a devious man is a snake; a firm man is a rock; a ruthless man is a wolf; drop a pebble into a pool and the ever-widening circles are the beautiful type of all influence. Because Nature is the symbol of Spirit it is ever new, ever significant, refreshing, restoring.

The groves were God's first temples; the Gothic cathedral seeks to reproduce the grandeur, the repose, the serenity of the forest; with columns like the boles of the trees, aisles like their arching branches, traceries of twig and leaf, splendors like the sunrise or the sunset through the twilight mystery of the primeval woods. Its mood is a matter of controlled light.

Gothic was the first architecture to expand and glorify the window. Early architecture, from the tepee of the Indian or the igloo of the Eskimo to the palace or the castle of the noble, was merely for defense—defense against weather or defense against war. Gothic brought in light as a new feature: the religion of Christ which developed Gothic is a religion of light; a glance at a concordance would seem to indicate that His teachings are first, last and always a study of light: "Ye are the light of the world."

The French crusaders returning home from the East brought with them all the essential features of Gothic. They took the pointed arch, the minaret, the slim spire, and combining them with the steep pitched roof of rainy Europe created a new architecture, type and symbol of Christ's teachings. And to this they added stained glass as the crowning glory.

Gothic architecture embodied—

1. Supreme Aspiration—reaching upward, ever upward.
2. Release of Power which Christianity brought to the world—
 - (a) End of Slavery—freedom of spirit
 - (b) Freedom of Women
 - (c) Free Schools
 - (d) Free Hospitals
 - (e) Free Art Schools

- (f) Free Artists and Artisans, with time ample to create supreme beauty in sculpture, painting, hand-illuminated books, gorgeous vestments.
3. Daring: The flying buttress; the vault thrusting ever higher till at Beauvais it at last fell down, exemplified the limitless invitation of the spirit to dare.
 4. Into this architecture the French medieval architect incorporated splendors of color in both wall and window, expanding it till the window reached from buttress to buttress, limiting it by one condition only—
 5. That it should rigidly *exclude white light*, and thus preserve the Gothic shadow aloft—the mystery and witchery of the forest, prototype of Gothic. Thus Christianity released the soaring vision of the spirit.

It is fascinating to think that this capture of the sunset and the rainbow in the *stained glass window*, one of mankind's supreme artistic achievements, was in reality the glorification of the simplest things; the transformation of the commonplace into the sublime, the celestial, for *stained glass* is merely common sand and common metals transmuted by the furnace into a matchless new substance.

The Oriental, the man most familiar with light, sought escape from the sun by repairing to a cool, dark interior. He placed his latticed window high up under the eaves to rest his eyes from glare, and then he found that his comfort was still further enhanced by tinting his glass in jewel fashion. The medieval French, most architectural of peoples, logically expanded the window, till eventually there was only wall enough to hold the glass.

Gothic soaring upward, symbolizing man's hope and aspiration as does no other architecture, also is the illustration that man's greatest happiness is in work—in constructive effort. Christ's teachings in this respect may be compressed into four words—"Be useful and kind." Gothic glorifies the arch as a symbol of kindness, of co-operation. Arches everywhere—arches, fan-vaulting, groining in nave and aisles; arches in every bay, every entrance, every window; arches with each stone helping to carry the load, and above them all the keystone distributing the strain. And flying buttresses, slim and airy in apogee Gothic at Le Mans like a spider's web, until the poets speak of them as lace and frozen music.

Then there was time for their creation; time for ornament; time for

the artist-craftsman to revel in his work; to ornament and decorate with infinite fancy and gaiety; to bring into his sculpture all the domestic and wild animals with which he was familiar—birds, dog, horse, cow, donkey, including them with the saints and evil spirits—as in Coutances, Laon, and the Marmoset Porch in Rouen, all without regard for time or expense. To the medieval man, if it was beautiful, that was enough. So it was until competition arrived and ended it all, for competition means the intensely practical, the elimination of the unnecessary, the end of leisure and, in the ultimate, competition means war. To end war, co-operation must be restored.

To crown all the foregoing, these happy architects and craftsmen took fine sand—silicon; and common metals—iron, copper, cobalt, and melted them together in a furnace heat of 2,500 degrees, producing jewels in a day, for which the processes of nature require millions of years. Of all the creations of man, is there any equal to this miracle of artificial jewels? And there proved to be another feature equally interesting, namely, that the beauty of stained glass continually enhances throughout the years. Erosion, dust crystallization, rain, merely add to its glory until a panel, seven hundred to eight hundred years old, from a half-ruined church, may be the costliest treasure of human handiwork, the first thing to be hidden underground in war, like gold coin of the realm.

Stained glass also symbolizes human traits: it is as fragile as a child and as winsome; as many-sided, as varied, as enchanting as lovely women. Age cannot wither, nor custom stale, its infinite variety; as enduring, as noble, as dependable and inspiring, as the character of a great man whose influence but increases with the years. But, like mankind, glass has no character or significance until transformed in the white heat of the furnace.

A panel of stained glass two feet square sold a few years ago at auction in New York for seventy thousand dollars; and a collection of small panels was listed, for the appraisal of an estate, at five hundred thousand dollars—values like the canvases of the greatest painters.

TWO SCHOOLS

As there are two schools of music—Italian and German—so, in like manner, there are two schools of stained glass, for the same reasons and inevitable to the contrasting temperaments of northern and southern people.

The Church of England in America naturally followed English tradition, English architecture and English glass, until the American architects

of the New York and Washington cathedrals pointed out the scientific reasons why light in the latitude of New York and Washington is necessarily so vastly different from the light of York in England. A noted English artist has observed that "The type of window suitable for Durham and York Minster is as inappropriate to the high light of Madrid and New York as a bathing suit would be in the desert of Sahara!"

A dozen years ago, the Bishop of Washington asked a stimulating question, "What is the lightest, full-colored cathedral in Europe?" and invited representatives of the Building Committee to seek the answer. Architects and glasspainters were sent to Europe to verify the Committee's findings and the Chapter which had been marching to England for a quarter of a century, turned and marched south into the heart of Spain, finding there the highest example of color plus light.

At the same time, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, under the guidance of Mr. Cram, acting independently, reached the same conclusion, discontinuing their English glass and substituting full color instead. The French movement in America was hailed with equal enthusiasm by both the American glasspainters and the public, as sound and scientific from every point of view; and one does not forget that this French movement was inaugurated by leading American architects, internationally known, and entirely apart from all vagaries of personal taste. It speaks volumes for their cogent reasons that the building committees of these two cathedrals and their open-minded Bishops reached unanimous conclusions.

Query: The American glasspainters observe that "Some American architects are of the English school of stained glass, but has anyone ever heard of an American glasspainter of the English school?"

The Puritans banished color both in window and in raiment. England has never escaped this Puritan taboo. The American glasspainters agree that, "There is no glass in England appropriate to this latitude except the French glass put there eight hundred years ago by Frenchmen."

THE TEST SETTING OR "ST. JOHN PLAN"

Again it was an architect, Mr. Cram, who inaugurated the policy of having an Advisory Committee of artist-craftsmen, who had spent their lives in the study of color and light in various countries here and abroad. This committee of colorists now passes upon color, to the great relief of building committees and to the great gain of art in America. Probably no

greater contribution to ecclesiastical building has been made for centuries. Both St. John the Divine and Washington Cathedral have now adopted this plan of immediately correcting, instead of perpetuating mistakes in this *most elusive* of all arts.

The medieval splendors of glass were possible only by this method of trial and error and since the ancient glass was made in the shadow of the cathedral, the test was perfectly simple.

The architects in charge there have pointed out how "Notwithstanding Simón's splendid success in his restorations at Rheims, he was defeated in New York before he began because of two factors; first, he was unacquainted with the brilliant sunshine and high light of this latitude; second, it was required that his glass should be shipped three thousand miles and then be set by strangers, thus making his windows orphans and excluding the indispensable principle of trial and error." Great art is not produced by mass production methods.

The question of whether music shall be largely Italian or largely German depends merely on personal taste, but the architects and artists observe that in stained glass no such choice is open or permissible. Light dictates the window; a good window in February with the snow on the ground may become a poor window in June with the foliage of a neighboring tree obstructing the light, for stained glass is merely stained light, a question largely of climate and latitude.

The Glasspainters' Yardsticks appended to this article tell how to recognize stained glass. Glasspainters are convinced of three fundamental facts: (1) The primary function of the stained glass in the Gothic church is to exclude white light. (2) Full color and full visibility have been and may be secured simultaneously, glass of all colors, and all colored, together with all the light desired. Areas of gray, grisaille, green-white, pearly hues, silver are both unnecessary for light and from every standpoint undesirable—decadent.

(But this prohibition of gray or colorless glass in no way restricts the glasspainter from use of technical "whites," as he calls the lighter tones by which he separates the primary colors.)

(3) The Puritans and Cistercians banished color for religious reasons, but it was not the Cistercians, it was the architects who demanded in Exeter "two thirds white and one third color." This is spoken of with approbation by our good friend, W. D. Caroe, resident architect at Canterbury, in his

letter deploring the American swing to full color. The architects, Scott and Lutyens, in Liverpool, show a similar preference for colorless glass; Bryn Athyn in Philadelphia is largely gray or grisaille; St. Ouen, and St. Mary's Redcliffe, in Bristol, two of the finest Gothic structures in Europe, have their beauty seriously marred by 80 to 90 per cent white glass. At Washington high authority recommended "silver canopies, silver angels, silver borders; medallions of color like rich jewels set in silver frames." For this reason, Washington's stained glass policy prohibits silver and grisaille. It is agreed that "In a Gothic church or cathedral stained glass is as indispensable as the roof, for without both the structure is a ruin—stark and bleak." Color is as vital as its sister, Music.

Architects and glasspainters observe that the volume of light depends upon (a) latitude, (b) climate, (c) glass area, (d) tone or shade of glass chosen, and (e) painting. Ste. Chapelle, Bourges, Troyes, St. Denis, Le Mans, and León prove that grisaille is unnecessary, since fully as much light is admitted from the use of yellow as by gray or green-white.

The Glasspainters' Yardsticks point out that all great windows, like the rainbow and all lovely sunsets, show a predominance of primary colors; they include the secondary colors but with the secondary colors always in secondary place. Examples of the world's greatest windows—the Crucifixion window in Poitiers, the Ascension window in Le Mans, the Belle Verriere and West Lancets in Chartres—show the simplicity of greatness. The finest sunsets are always a great smash of red against the blue sky, the whole suffused by the golden light of late afternoon. Doubtless the good Lord might have made the sky green, the sea orange, the sun turquoise, the grass violet or purple-brown but happily He did not. He does not break the laws He makes.

It is agreed that Abbé Sugér of Chartres is remembered, not because he was a great Bishop, but because he was the greatest colorist of whom the world has record. Happily, he presided over a young, primitive people at the highest point in spiritual life, in vigor, and achievement ever touched in Europe, as marked by the Crusades.

The Cistercians and the Puritans renounced color, banished it as wicked because it was cheery and happy, as no doubt they would have banished the sunset if they had had the power—just as they prohibited bathing; it was pleasant—therefore, it was wicked!

Washington Cathedral accepts the glasspainter's view that the fifteenth-

century medallions of color set in a field of gray glass is sheer, unmitigated decadence; and to his everlasting credit when this was required of the glasspainter, he indignantly protested, "I would rather starve than execute such windows!"

No doubt the lovers of German music have small patience with the Italian school, and, likewise the English school of glass are quite unsympathetic to the full color of the French masters. These two schools can be easily studied in Washington Cathedral's fifteenth-century high-altar windows, sixty-five feet in height; also in the apse of St. John the Divine, and the apse chapels—English as compared with the French school of full color in St. John the Divine's nave. Glasspainters and critics here and in France confirm that the predominance of green in the sixteenth century Rose of Ste. Chapelle, Paris; in Fairford, England; in the Crypt Chapel at Washington Cathedral; in the apse of St. John the Divine are inexcusable violations of the fundamental principle that "secondary colors must always take secondary place." This principle also rejects the orange lancets in the west front of York Minister, as well as their much talked about "Five Sisters." England is a green gem set in a gray sea, and English glass is largely gray and green.

Climate made the Swede a blonde; climate made the Italian a brunette; climate made the African a black. Climate made the polar bear and arctic fox white; climate made the zebra and the tiger striped. We cannot escape our environment. There is a wide difference between the climate and light of England and America.

Americans are a young people in a New World—a most colorful land with its thousands of square miles of goldenrod and golden grain; its gorgeous New England autumns when the woods are ablaze; its Painted Desert and its astonishingly painted Grand Canyon. They will not willingly go back to the anemic tones of Chinese pottery or the jazz effects—the syncopated color—of Persian rugs; they will not feel at home in the grays and greens that pleased their ancestors in England with its fogs and its rains. They are not prepared to accept the English glasspainters' prediction, that "Ten years will see the end of America's swing to the twelfth- and thirteenth-century color."

Assuming it to be true, as adherents of the English school state, that "Secondary colors, gray, orange, green, violet, and purple-brown, are more subtle, intellectual, cultivated than are the primary reds, blues and yellows;"—two per cent of our people are subtle, intellectual, cultivated;

ninety-eight per cent love the color that children love. Should the cathedral pulpit, its music, its color be addressed to the two per cent or to the other ninety-eight?

Current magazines describe the new profession of color engineering, where trained experts may be called in to transform a schoolroom, department store, hospital, restaurant, or ballroom from a dreary failure into a gay, happy environment, a psychological success. They point out that it is difficult to overestimate the psychological significance of color. Glass-painters, critics and even casual visitors observe that León is the gayest, most joyful cathedral to be found in Europe, unbelievably harmonious and happy—victorious, celebrating the expulsion of the Moor. No great art ever arose save as the expression of supreme spiritual elation.

Many are the tributes that have been paid by visitors to León: "These windows are like a glowing lantern; and why these windows are like a glowing lantern is that all reflect the mentality and spirituality of the men who created them—this is the soul, if we can use this term, of the window and this is what causes that peculiar emotion that every lover of beauty feels when looking at them." G. Owen Bonawit, Glasspainter.

"The effect of entering the cathedral is really one of surpassing beauty—a glow of color everywhere, of ever-changing harmony of colors, as the moving sun throws the shadows of buttresses first on one window, then on another, one window after another emerging from shadow into brilliance. It is indescribable and yet not in any sense disturbing. It is not the music of trumpets blaring forth glory, it is the deep, pulsing harmony of a great organ, a prelude to hymns of faith and praise." H. B. Little, Architect.

"It is difficult to exaggerate the beauty of the interior of León. The light effects are entrancingly beautiful under all conditions. I saw the cathedral morning, noon and evening, in brilliant sunshine, in dim sunshine and when the heavens were cloudy. Everywhere, at all times, the vision of light was glorious." Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes.

"Again and again I remained at the cathedral to watch the colors fade into the night that I might note which colors held the longest; the reds faded first; the yellow holding to the last. As I sat there, the effect was like so many holy fires being kindled to the glory of God throughout this great interior and like glowing embers fading into the night, being rekindled here and there by the red lights and burning tapers, a never-to-be-forgotten experience." Nicola D'Ascenzo, Glasspainter.

"Some of the most wonderful windows I have ever seen. The finest examples of fourteenth-century glass of which I know, competing at their best with the glorious windows of Chartres, Canterbury and Poitiers." . . . "These Spanish artists seem to have been *intoxicated* with the wonder of color."

"In León's favorite window the color percentages are:

Blue	23.5
Red	23.2
Yellow	16.
"Whites"	12.4
Green	10.8
Purple-Brown	7.85
Flesh	3.
Iron work and error	3.25
<hr/>	
Total	100%

Lawrence Saint, Glasspainter.

"In León, Spain possesses one of the very noblest and purest examples of French Gothic. Supreme type of the Gothic ideal, a delicate house of glass, finely poised between buttresses. . . . In the sphere of devotion, the Spaniard's romantic instinct is always right." Havelock Ellis, Philosopher.

"The first sensation on entering León is that of sheer joy, perfect elation (not exaltation). If in Chartres the path is long before the sanctuary is reached, here it seems one has arrived; one enters Paradise without the need of any pilgrimage. . . . The people in the León clerestory seem to belong to a human choir, not a heavenly one. They are meek; they stretch out a welcoming hand, equally courteous and noble." Helene Bousinesq, Critic, Paris.

"The first thought of León Cathedral is color; the second is grace. Two hundred and thirty windows with eighteen hundred square yards of stained glass, a gorgeous dream of color, the magnificent windows glow all day long. The color is indescribable." Professor Parr in *The Gentleman's Magazine*.

"The dominating note in León Cathedral is that of gold and saffron, balanced by beautiful reds, blues, greens and purples—nearly every color imaginable, primary or secondary. The light carries clear across the church, one hundred and fifty feet; the windows are magnificent." Earl E. Sanborn, Glasspainter.

"The effect was beautiful and uplifting far beyond any ability to describe." E. Donald Robb, Architect.

"León has no true grisaille. It is completely glorious with full color. It is unique. It has a marvelous richness and warmth of tone even on a cold, cloudy day; the atmospheric quality of a rainbow at sunset, and all the windows pitched in the *same key*. . . . The large areas of massed color give great carrying power." Joseph G. Reynolds, Jr., Glasspainter.

"We all agreed that León represents a maximum of color, plus light. . . . A lovely golden light filters through the glass. . . . A never-to-be-forgotten thrill." W. H. Burnham, Glasspainter.

"To walk into León Cathedral is to walk straight into the presence of the Living God." A Des Moines Banker.

SEQUENCE

Nothing is more convincing than that the universe about us everywhere shows design, sequence, a guiding plan, purpose—from the frost on the windowpane to the ordered movement of the stars. Four hundred years ago Ponce de León said a farewell prayer in the Cathedral of León before leaving to join Columbus on his second voyage. He landed in Florida on Palm Sunday, cross in hand, with the vision and purpose in his heart of bringing to the new world a replica of his own cathedral.

Three centuries later, George Washington, planning the nation's capital on the Potomac with Major L'Enfant, his French engineer, specified "A great church for national purposes."

One century later still, the foundation stone of Washington Cathedral was laid. And a quarter century after, the Bishops of Washington and New York had their glasspainters back in the home of Ponce de León studying the glass. Thus the dream comes true of bringing the glories of the sunset in Spain across in the same latitude to America. There are those who see design in that sequence—who believe it to be more than accidental.

Now Russia and to a too great extent America are seeking to rear their children without religious teaching, discarding it in the home and prohibiting it in the schools, a state of things found nowhere else in history. Are we satisfied with the result?

William Penn in 1679 said, "For I want to tell you, gentlemen, if we miscarry, it will be our own fault; we have no one else to blame, for such is the happiness of our situation that we cannot well be destroyed but by

ourselves." We are where we are because we are what we are—politically, economically, industrially, aesthetically. As we get the government we deserve so also we get the stained glass we deserve.

Great windows, great music, great architecture, all have a cosmic quality—elemental—understood of all men; like the ground-swell of the sea, the sunset, the rainbow, the Sermon on the Mount, they need no interpreter. They are the voice of God in the soul of man.

"Beauty is the smile upon the face of truth." Markham.

"Beauty is God made manifest." Locke.

HOW TO TELL STAINED GLASS

THE GLASSPAINTERS' YARDSTICKS*

1. **DESIGN.** A stained-glass window is transformed light. A good window must always be a design in colored light. Figures suggesting a story should be drawn as abstract decoration. Pictures or portraits should never be used.
2. **COLOR.** The greatest results have been everywhere secured by featuring all the primary colors—red, yellow and blue, beautifully balanced. Disaster and defeat attend the featuring of the secondary colors—orange, green and violet.
3. **ICONOGRAPHY.** The color effect and the legibility of the design are always more important than the story. If too much storytelling is crowded into a given space confusion results—unity and legibility are lost. A wealth of detail may effectively be used if the final result is characterized by breadth and simplicity.
4. **LUMINOSITY.** A good window does not go dead when the sun withdraws. It has high luminosity at every hour of the day.
5. **HARMONY.** A good window does not gleam or glare with the sun upon it. It glows all day long, even in cloud or rain. No good window contains portions which jump out of their places, being too bright for their surroundings. If the color values are right the window will not glare.
6. **UNITY.** Unity of design and color-effect not only in a single window but in all the windows in a given building is vital. A collection of good windows without unity is necessarily a failure.
7. **COLOR PLUS LIGHT.** The world's great masterpieces in stained glass prove that ample color and adequate light have been and can be secured together.
8. **VARIETY.** The glass of León Cathedral, Spain, proves that the unrestricted use of the three primary colors red, blue and yellow, can give not only a wealth of color but infinite variety.

* Formulated by Mr. James Sheldon, revised by Joseph G. Reynolds, Jr., glasspainter, and unanimously approved by the leading stained-glass artist-craftsmen of America.

Improving Our Hymns

J. V. MOLDENHAWER

MY phrasing of the title of this simple essay derives from my reading of books on Shakespeare. A volume entitled *Shakespeare Improved*, by Hazelton Spencer, is a fascinating and frequently amusing account of the energetic and optimistic efforts of a number of second- and third- and fourth-rate writers—as well as two or three men of real genius—to rewrite Shakespeare's plays. The effort naturally would not have been made except for the belief that the work needed doing and could be done. This to us is startling enough, but more startling still is the fact that when these gentlemen looked upon their work they found it very good. I can fancy the self-satisfied smirk with which Dryden and Davenant looked at their rehashed "Tempest," and the glow of sentimental joy that filled the heart of Nahum Tate when he had pulled "King Lear" apart and stuck it together again with a happy ending. This, I felt, is and must be the cheerful mood of the persons who with each new edition of a hymnbook set about their congenial performance of chopping and changing. They are apparently never so happy as when they are taking possession of the work of a better man and making it over to suit themselves, as if they were forming a private and personal anthology of poetry and song. I wish they could get it into their heads that they are handling the accumulated tradition of the Church's popular hymnody, which belongs, if it belongs to anyone, to the people of the Church. Such a view would lead to discreet and sober revision and put an end once for all to a long record of unscrupulous and unsanctified meddling.

This essay lays no claim to a background of wide learning in hymnology. I confess to an ignorance far wider than my knowledge. Here is rather an utterance of the exasperated impotence which I have so often felt on meeting awkward unfamiliar things in a hymnbook when I was thinking I could depend upon that excellent sameness which is the essence of a good liturgy, no matter how simple the order of worship may be. Conservative or reactionary, whichever word may be the right one, this is what long practice in the use of the hymnbook makes us.

I concede quite cheerfully that there have been many changes for the

better. I can also put my finger on a number of surviving original phrasings that could (as I fancy) be set right with very little trouble. (There is, for example, the identical rhyme, "one" and "won" in the last stanza of "The Church's one foundation.") A number of hymns to be made usable in length have had to be made so by selecting a certain number of stanzas in one long original, and the debate about which stanzas to choose could of course be endless. Here one accepts adaptation and selection as essential. We may concede also the propriety of leaving out of each new book certain hymns that are practically unused. And finally one may admit that a number of revisions have become so far generally the only well-known version that it is mere pedantry to try to restore the original phrase to its place. Such a revision as for example "Joyful and triumphant," has in my opinion, by long use and also on its merits, definitely replaced Oakley's original rendering, "Joyfully triumphant."

Let us consider first the often drastic effort to improve the book itself by omitting from a revised version a considerable number of hymns. The omission may be decided upon for several reasons. General disuse is probably the first and apparently most obvious. Here it is necessary, if the omission is to be well supported, to make something more than a cursory inquiry among the members of the committee and their friends. I have been led to suppose that this wider investigation is sometimes not too carefully made. It would seem to be enough for practical purposes to discover that among the truly enlightened these hymns are simply not sung any longer. To bolster this determination they have the comfortable certainty of their own impeccable taste, which so pleasantly helps to prove that persons who still would like to sing these particular hymns are deplorably lacking in judgment and that therefore it is an act of true charity and piety to save them from themselves. "It must be used very little nowadays!" "It is a pity it should be used at all." So we can hear them agree as with shuddering relief they drop into the wastebasket or consign to the company of a pitifully inadequate tune that no one will wish to employ:

"There is a fountain filled with blood
Drawn from Emmanuel's veins;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

And they are wrong, on the second count if not on the first. If the hymn is sung but little, it should be sung often and everywhere. The only fault, if

it is a fault in rhapsody, is in excess of imagination. But what symbol, what figure of speech is at once mighty enough and unshapely enough to bear the vast illogic of the truth of the cruel death of the Son of God for the salvation of sinners? "He that knew no sin was made sin for us." The hymn is no more crooked and unseemly and terrible and overpowering than that. The truth is that we shall soon be without the hymnody of superrational rapture if by little and little we leave off singing the hymns in which the excess of the imagined picture tears its upward way through the gross but effective symbol. These hymns are only for the deeply experienced and incredibly grateful heart, conscious at once of bruise and balm unspeakable. Only those know what it means who sing it in this mood. Men overwhelmed with thanksgiving for the forgiveness of their sins sang it in the days of the great revivals. And it will be a grim day of regret and misgiving for the Church when its thundering and chaotic compound of wailing and praise is no longer heard.

This particular consideration of the proper choice of hymns to be omitted in revised editions of any hymnal may well conclude with a personal expression of regret with respect to certain songs of experience the absence of which others also must certainly deplore. I am definitely unreconciled to the removal of

"Come, we that love the Lord,
And let our joys be known;"

especially when I remember the third stanza, "The men of grace have found Glory begun below." Nor am I happy when the congregation is no longer permitted to sing the sturdy old hymn of trust and warning and defiance, "My soul, be on thy guard." Others frequently cast out, apparently without regret and certainly without apology, are "Hark! the sound of holy voices," "Come, sound His praise abroad," "Again, as evening's shadow falls," which we in our church so frequently sing to the Beethoven air; "Am I a soldier of the cross"—an omission so glaring in its unfeeling ignorance as to be almost incredible. We often search in vain for Edmund Sears' famous second Christmas hymn, "Calm on the listening ear of night"; the Advent season calls vainly for "Christians, awake! salute the happy morn." Bishop Ken's "Awake, my soul, and with the sun," and Richard Baxter's "Lord, it belongs not to my care," are often excluded.

Returning to the habit of omitting stanzas in hymns that are in part retained we may safely suppose that the consideration of space on the page

is foremost. Yet there are not a few instances of deletion where it would have been just as feasible to print, let us say, all four or five of the traditional stanzas as the surviving three or four which are retained. Again enters the unflattering suggestion that a stanza was left out because the reviser failed to appreciate its importance in the structure of the hymn. So to save an inch and a half in printing (which could be managed by compression), or a minute of singing time, we drop overboard what has given for generations a peculiar and characteristic mood to that hymn. Try singing "The Church's one foundation" in the new Presbyterian Hymnal, and only a grossly forgetful or inattentive person can fail to know that something is missing. Indeed it is—the whole stanza which expresses the religious and psychological miracle of faith in the Church (which is after all an article of the Creed)—that is missing—the tumultuous and magnificent and cross-grained stanza that runs for four lines thus:

"Though with a scornful wonder
Men see her sore oppressed,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distressed . . ."

This is left out! And it is the very fact that the Church, the Holy Catholic Church, lives inevitably and ever in this tragic disunion—it is this, I say, that gives such combined violence and poignancy to our declaration of love and loyalty. And what pallid little devil of estheticism has made us leave out in "When I survey the wondrous cross":

"His dying Crimson, like a Robe,
Spreads o'er his Body on the Tree;
Then am I dead to all the Globe,
And all the Globe is dead to me."

Exaggeration? If you like. But here, as in "The fountain filled with blood, drawn from Emmanuel's veins" we are fixed by the tremendous symbol. We are standing, as by God's grace we stand every Good Friday, in an overpowering contemplation, rapt and conscience-stricken by the awful and terrible mercy of God that spared not His own Son but gave Him up to the death of the Cross for us men and for our salvation. Less profound in significance but still irritating are some stanza-omissions to be noted in almost every hymnbook. Why eviscerate "I love to tell the story," leaving only the first and the last stanzas? What is the point in deciding that "Faith of our fathers" serves just as well with three stanzas as with four? What had the reviser

against stanza II that concerns the sweetness of death by martyrdom for the Word of God—except perhaps, horrid thought—the fact that practical religionists do not believe in such sentiments? Perhaps on second thought we have no right to this hymn at all, or at least no more right than a Unitarian has to “Holy, Holy, Holy.” Its honored and pious author was offering before God the prayer that all men, especially the people of his own beloved England, might come back to the faith of their fathers, and that meant with vivid and even painful distinctness the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. We can expunge that, and we have expunged it, since the original line about the prayers of Mary had of course to be at once suppressed. “For all the saints who from their labors rest” is one of our truly great hymns. It is long, but all the eight stanzas are properly related to each other in its grand forward movement. No consideration of time should make us content with singing an attenuated version of five stanzas omitting stanzas IV, V, and VI, which begin in their turn, “O blest communion, fellowship divine,” “And when the strife is fierce, the warfare long,” and “The golden evening brightens in the west.”

In the original version of “Christian, dost thou see them” we have “How the hosts of Midian Prowl and prowl around.” (Prowl is good, very excellent good.) This becomes, and remains in most of our books, “How the powers of darkness Rage thy steps around.” (I am still not complaining—*rage* also is good.) But in “The New Hymnal for American Youth,” of all places, we have “compass thee around,” a lumbering misstep into mere commonplace. In “Rejoice, ye pure in heart,” we have at first, “Your orient banner wave on high,” which banner is later changed to a “festal” or a “glorious” one, as you please. Mere wilfulness, reviser-mania—orient is a splendid word. As if that were not enough, the native eight stanzas are considered too many and are cut to five, leaving out the three beginning “Bright youth and snow-crowned age,” “Your clear hosannas raise,” and “At last the march shall end”—the reassuring sound of which last ought certainly to have saved it from the shears. Whittier’s “Dear Lord and Father of mankind” reads rightly in stanza V, “Breathe through the heats of our desire.” I think it must have been a conclave of maiden aunts that pursed their lips at this and quickly altered it to “Breathe through the pulses of desire,” though even from their point of view I cannot see how they have helped matters much. One supposes that they might remember moments when the quickening of the pulses portended something which according to

their queer standards, ought not to be even alluded to in a hymn. The beautiful and well-beloved "Jesus calls us: o'er the tumult," came into being as a hymn for Saint Andrew's Day. Stanza II therefore began as it had good right to, "As, of old, Saint Andrew heard it, By the Galilean lake." It should be maddening not only to any good Catholic, but to any Scotsman, to see that dulled and diminished by the common nonconformist version, "As, of old, apostles heard it." Your sharp single figure has given place to a group, so we have at once obscurity and confusion. This same tendency of revisers to dull the edge of a song by removing the personal allusion is to be observed in certain versions of "Nearer, my God, to Thee," where we are made to sing:

"Though like a wanderer,
The sun gone down . . ."

instead of "Though like *the* wanderer . . ." The whole poem is alive with allusion to Jacob, so it seems peculiarly silly to let the hand wave about gently at this stage instead of pointing out with it the man who, fleeing from the face of his brother Esau, has even now "lighted upon a certain place and tarried there because the sun was set." The same evasion of the particular we find in Whittier's hymn,

"We may not climb the heavenly steeps,
To bring the Lord Christ down,"

where certain versions give us "the healing of *the* seamless dress," instead of the moving distinctness conveyed by "the healing of *His* seamless dress." "Love divine, all loves excelling," appears sometimes with four stanzas, sometimes with three. In the latter case the one chosen for extinction is usually that which begins,

"Breathe, O breathe Thy loving Spirit
Into every troubled breast!"

a prayer which seems to me both natural and lovely. Even Newman's high reputation as a master of English has not saved "Lead, kindly light," from being tampered with by quite confident fingers. The now sacrosanct beginning was once changed to "Lead, Saviour, lead"! And "garish day" had one bad moment whence it emerged as "glare of day." Garish was no doubt thought to be caviare to the general.

"From Greenland's icy mountains" can always start a tempest in a teapot, especially since that frabjous day when the inhabitants of Ceylon's isle

are said to have risen in protest against the implied disparagement of their virtuous lives in the lines,

"Though every prospect pleases,
And only man is vile."

Personally I regard the flattering reference to the climate as a very handsome quid pro quo. But let that pass. Well, as long ago as 1827, a year after the hymn was born, a very alert editor changed it for the moment into "Java's isle." Canon Douglas of Denver tells us that he meant to push the implied slur out upon some ground beyond the dominions of Britain. And the Canon is a sound man. Whether the Javanese resented this abortive effort to blacken their good name I have not heard. What most disputers forget is that Reginald Heber was too good a Christian not to know that his observation on man was just the orthodox and true doctrine about man everywhere—whose nature it is to be never quite so good as the climate he enjoys. The one really just and relevant revision would be that which might run—changing place names as the location of the congregation determined,

"What though the ocean breezes
Blow o'er Manhattan's isle" . . . and so on.

The plain truth is of course that a man who like Bishop Heber poured out his soul unto death for his blind heathen, deserves to have his hymn kept and sung as he wrote it.

We turn again to an old favorite only to learn that the very beginning of it is not as the author made it. Charles Wesley did not write

"Hark! the herald angels sing,
'Glory to the new-born King';"

but

"Hark, how all the welkin rings,
'Glory to the King of Kings'."

Familiar as we all are with the received text, I think it must be admitted that the critic of revision is right who says that the original is marked by a more robust joyousness, that it is indeed a very shout of happy welcome. We find a peculiar minor change in that soberly glowing hymn, "Begin, my tongue, some heavenly theme, And speak some boundless thing." Where Watts wrote,

"Sing the sweet promise of His grace,
And the performing God,"

we have "our redeeming God." I can imagine the reasoning here from my

knowledge of the many other than religious associations belonging to the word "performing." Yet the reason is not good enough. Redeeming just lacks that quick and immediate relation to a promise which the word "performing" has. It should stand as written.

The hymnbook is a popular compilation. It is indeed vulgar in the good sense of the word—sometimes, perhaps inevitably, in a sense not quite so good; but it belongs to all the people and we must be careful not to deprive that mass of folk, still unlearned in the most literate countries, of their right to sing the praise of God in words and music which most readily interpret their adoration and aspirations. I am ashamed to think how many times I have been unwilling to choose some song of the older Zion which would have quickened the heart beat of a hundred simple people who were more sure to be present on the coming Lord's day than those whose tastes I was prepared to consider. Part of my lesson I have by now learned; and I hope to see drawn back into their place in the hour of worship single stanzas and whole hymns that have long suffered more than their due of neglect and disparagement. I shall hope to sing them with the approval of really intelligent hymnodic highbrows. Not only shall "Come, we that love the Lord" be sung, but at times at least it shall make the welkin ring with the really popular tune which swings after every stanza into the stirring refrain:

"We're marching to Zion,
Beautiful, beautiful Zion,
We're marching upward to Zion,
The beautiful city of God."

It may sound a little irrelevant, but it is only distant. And it recalls as the proper climax of all Christian song that we are pilgrims on our way to a City. Even the oft-repeated comment on a divided Christendom, offered by the sort of people who take their comments ready-made, "We travel by different roads, but we are going to the same place" is rather movingly true, though it may sound like the tritest of platitudes. They do mean that all good Christians view the triumph from afar and seize it with their eye.

I am quite prepared to be told that this essay is superficial and one-sided. Against that accusation I shall offer the defense that I have intended nothing more than an incitement to penitence and restitution. We have made such good progress in the revival of interest in Church Music and Worship. Our new Hymnals are excellent books and all my irritation over their faults does not persuade me out of my preference for them over their

predecessors. I have made a comparison of indexes which proves the presence of a rich amount of good material not contained in the older volumes. But we must keep recalling to remembrance the great desideratum enshrined in the words "Let all the people praise Thee!" It is pleasing to think ourselves musically intellectual and to turn up our noses haughtily at certain so-called "impossible" hymns and tunes. But something else is even more important and that is the recovery of the lost rapture of Christian communal song. Every step in the elaboration of society is likely also to mean a step further in the adoption of refinements in worship which involve far heavier penalties than we can possibly foresee. Listen and perpend. When over the radio you hear a quite famous band of singers render what is alleged to be one of the Negro Spirituals, more often than not you will note, and if you were properly brought up you will be shocked by the discovery, that what you are hearing has been sophisticated out of all nature by the gadgety harmonization which it has undergone at the hands of some ambitious musical baggage-smasher.

What follows for the next page or so should be marked "Loan Exhibit," since the examples have been furnished by a good friend of mine, and since it is his examination and comparison to which I am indebted. I may add that he is not only an enthusiastic but a reliable and well-informed student in these matters. In John Addington Symonds' "These things shall be: a loftier race," there are the following lines:

"Nation with nation, land with land,
Inarmed shall live as comrades free."

Inarmed has been changed in certain versions to *Unarmed*, in order evidently to make it a disarmament hymn. But as my commentator says, the change is for the worse, as it does not mean what the author wrote.

The Unitarians, as was to be expected, have played glad havoc with some of our handsomest Trinitarian hymns. My friend says, "they have done some agile altering," and, with these two or three examples before us we shall no doubt agree with him. "Holy, Holy, Holy" is altered in two places by substituting for "God in Three Persons, blessed Trinity" the last line of the omitted second stanza, "Which (who) wert, and art, and evermore shalt be." Having appropriated this line from stanza II they had to jettison the rest, though even a rigidly erect Unitarian could hardly fail to enjoy the spectacle opened for him of the eternal adoration of the Eternal God

by saints and cherubim and seraphim. In "Hark! the herald angels sing" they change:

"Mild He lays His glory by
Born that man no more may die."

to this:

"Gracious bond of earth and sky,
Born that man no more may die."

They had better be careful! There is more subtle metaphysics implicit in that first phrase than immediately meets the eye. Well, well, "much of this is sad stuff," as George III said after some conscientious and apparently not too happy perusal of Shakespeare's plays!

Then there are the Adventists, whose alterations seem quite captious though the governing theological presumption may be plain enough to the initiate. Why, in "Alas! and did my Saviour bleed" did they change:

"Was it for crimes that I had done?"

to:

"It was because we were undone." . . . ?

And why, in "All hail the power of Jesus' Name," should "Sinners, whose love can ne'er forget" become "Ye saints, whose love" . . . etc.? If the obvious reason is the right one it involves some very uncomplimentary reflections concerning this peculiar sect. I close these citations with the choicest piece furnished by my friendly helper, culled from a Skeptic's Hymnal, entitled "Social Hymns for the Use of Friends of the Rational System." Here Watts' good old Christmas hymn is given thus:

"Joy to the world! the *light* is come!
The only lawful King:
Let every heart prepare it room
And moral nature sing."

And that, one conjectures, was expected to raise the emotional temperature measurably in the place where the rational comrades were assembled.

I add a note concerning my own confusion when I came to announce "O come, all ye faithful." Not only does it seem to be true, as one observer says, that "this hymn has been translated so many times and changed so many times that it is hard to tell whether the version we like comes earlier or later"; it is also nearly impossible to guess what words we are to see when we open

a book of praise with which we are not familiar. I was galvanized into a distracted inattention to the mood of the day when in the second stanza I found myself compelled to sing:

"The Brightness of glory,
Light of light eternal,"

where I and all the older generation had long been used to the traditional adjustment of the air to the majestic old literal translation of "Deum de deo, lumen de lumine," "God of God, Light of Light." I can go no further with this, but cheerfully promise any amount of exasperated entertainment to whosoever will pursue the inquiry for himself.

We are nowadays hearing less frequently than we used to that sterling baritone Oscar Seagle. But in the days when he gave his concerts often, it was almost a custom with him to sing before he finished his program that magnificent thriller of evangelistic days,

"There were ninety-and-nine that safely lay
In the shelter of the fold,
But the one was out on the hills astray,
Far off from the gates of gold"

His audiences were always enthralled, even if the musical critics—somewhat uncertain laddies at best—suffered what General Hugh Johnson so engagingly refers to as "an agony in the neck." The tumult of pain and fear, of rescue and triumph in that singing was something indescribable. And it was simply the beautifully just and adequate rendering of what the song itself contains and suggests. It is my opinion that few of the classic pieces in the hymnody of the Christian Church have more perfectly voiced the sense of the mystery of the redeeming love than has this one tremendous stanza:

"But none of the ransomed ever knew
How deep were the waters crossed,
Nor how dark was the night that the Lord passed through
Ere He found the sheep that was lost."

That joy in the thought of an almost unbelievable deliverance is at the very center of Christian experience. And if you do not sing, and plentifully, of that redemption, no amount of professional pruning and paring and removing of eccentricities will do us any great good.

The best of the present movement is its devotion to the discovery and recovery of things noble and strong and decorous. But it is possible to pur-

chase decorum at the cost of rapture. And decorum is, quite frankly, not worth the price. In my student days Edwin Hatch's Hibbert Lectures of 1888 were highly esteemed. How the book has weathered another forty years I do not know, but at least one paragraph deserves to be read and re-read by all men who are concerned not only in serving the Church as an institution, but in ministering to its constant inner liveliness of experience and expression. He is speaking of the interacting influence between the Christian Church and the Hellenistic society. "If on the one hand it incorporated Christianity with the larger humanity from which it had at first been isolated, yet on the other hand, by crushing uncultivated earnestness, and by laying more stress on the expression of ideas than upon the ideas themselves, it tended to stem the very forces which had given Christianity its place, and to change the rushing torrent of the river of God into a broad but feeble stream." And that is the one bad end from which our hymnody must be saved. And that consideration should present itself in a moment of pause to each revision committee before it calls common or unclean something which God Himself has blown clean by the breath of the Spirit.

Bible Words as Book Titles

ROBERT B. PATTISON

THERE is a book so aged that it is ageless, so modern that authors of today borrow from its pages—The Bible. It is an amazing book, a book to which the masters of literature acknowledge allegiance as a literary masterpiece. "Shakespeare leaned on the Bible," said Emerson, adding that Milton, Bunyan, Ruskin, Addison, Cowper, Browning, Tennyson, Whittier and many others drew large inspiration from it.

Our finest magazines and newspapers advocate this book as a textbook for journalists. Dana, leader among editorial writers, advised his reporters to study the Bible if they would become experts. The staff of the Miami Herald confesses that next to the dictionary the Bible is most called for in its rooms. The New York Evening Post frankly stated that the craft of newspaper writers can be and is benefited by familiarity with the style of the Bible.

It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that many modern authors have obtained from the Bible titles for their works. There is something about the way the Bible puts things that gives sales value to novels, whose titles are drawn therefrom; the name on the cover encourages the reading of what is under the cover. If "words are things," these words possess peculiar weight and color.

Appended to this article is a list of over two hundred books, including a few plays, with Biblical titles. No systematic search was made to obtain these titles. Had this been done the list would easily have been much extended—a valuable testimony to the considerable use made of the Bible for this purpose.

Such a list becomes all the more remarkable when it is noted that no religious books are included. It would be altogether natural to expect a book of spiritual import to employ some phrase out of the Bible as its title (such, for instance, as *The Heathen Rage*, by G. S. Lee, or *Joseph and His Brothers*, by Thomas Mann). But this list comprises novels and plays which have no religious basis, though doubtless many of them hold ethical values of a high order.

The arrangement is according to the order of Bible books and is therefore

not chronological as to dates of publication. Taking this list as a reasonable cross section to indicate how some present-day writers have utilized the Bible, as if it were a ripened field from which choice sheaves might be gleaned for their special use, there are noticeable deductions to be drawn.

It is observable that the words of Jesus hold first place. This is scarcely remarkable, for, as in His religious instruction, so also in His use of language, "Never man spake like this man!" With authors of today as with the listeners of His own day, His words possess authority. In this odd way is fulfilled Christ's personal prophecy, "My words shall not pass away."

Jesus had the faculty of saying common things in an uncommon manner. His phrases were often so startling, so unusual and impelling, that modern writers have adopted them to give distinction to their novels.

Many titles are taken directly from the Sermon on the Mount, and more than one author employs the same phrase, as "Salt of the Earth," or "To Him That Hath." What sermon is more worthy to be quoted than this, which Erasmus declared was above the eloquence of Cicero? Tolstoy called for its reading during his dying hour; it appealed to and satisfied his sense both of sound and of spirit. That which Daniel Webster, master of words, declared "cannot be a mere human production, the whole history of man proves it," may well be considered as some heavenly star from whose brilliance modern writers have caught gleams of pure light and embodied them in the titles of books.

The Lord's Prayer has provided nine recorded titles, used both as titles for novels and for plays, the plays probably being founded on the books.

The Psalms hold second place in popularity. Of the two hundred and thirty-five titles, twenty-nine are from the Psalter, one eighth of the entire list. Human nature so sings its worth or laments its sin in this book of the Bible that we would naturally expect its words to be borrowed for modern novel designations. This mirror of the human spirit rightly finds itself reflected in many of the book titles of our day, lending itself to Heine's characterization of the Psalms: "sunrise and sunset, birth and death, promise and fulfillment, the whole drama of humanity."

Proverbs has a prominent place, for therein, as with the Psalms, the strength and the frailty of mankind are described. What then more natural than that authors should condense their words into a line from Proverbs, and show that line on the book jacket? To a student who had said to Francis Wayland, when President of Brown University, that he did not see anything

remarkable about Proverbs, the discerning teacher replied, "Write a few, my son; write a few!" The discriminating writers of our fiction do better; they borrow Proverbs without comment.

Other Bible books are drawn from freely; Genesis among the foremost—perhaps we wonder why. The Prophets utter oracles from book covers; the Epistles have been utilized; and recall the remark made by Robert Louis Stevenson to his friend Smeaton, "I say, Smeaton, have you ever read finer prose than in Ephesians and Philippians?" That question has all the more significance when we remember that Stevenson knew whole chapters of the Bible by heart.

As we would readily anticipate, the more poetic and imaginative books provide the most titles—Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah. Is it this poetic quality which explains the many titles from Genesis? All primitive people by very nature think and speak poetically—not, of course, that this quality is limited to such. Jesus had the mind and heart of a poet to a marked degree; His thoughts had purity and idealty. And He clothed them in beauty.

It is to be noted that authors of prominence make use of the Bible in this way. We find such names as Arnold Bennett, with five titles; Winston Churchill and Thomas Dixon with three; Gilbert Parker, Margaret Deland, Mary Johnston, Edith Wharton and Mark Twain with two; while Hall Caine, Rudyard Kipling, James Hilton, Thornton Wilder, Pearl Buck, and the authoress of the most popular novel of the century, Margaret Mitchell, of "Gone With the Wind" fame, are represented.

There are other authors, who have not yet won outstanding recognition, whose use of the Bible gives distinction to their books and will lend its aid in making them better known. In the familiar words of William Lyon Phelps, "The English Bible has been a greater influence on the course of English literature than all other forces put together; it is impossible to read standard authors intelligently without knowing something about the Bible, for they all assume familiarity with it on the part of their readers. Not only standard but contemporary authors exhibit, consciously or unconsciously, intimacy with the Scriptures. So universally true is this that to any young man or woman eaten with ambition to become a writer, I should advise first of all 'Know the Bible'. I read an enormous number of contemporary novels and plays. I do not think I have read a single author who does not show familiarity with the greatest of books."

Four hundred years ago the whole Bible was first printed in our English language. How many Biblical phrases have been used as book titles during these four centuries no one could possibly ascertain. The first three of these four centuries saw few books and of these very few were fictional. The great increase in light reading, in popular fiction, has come in the last one hundred years, so that we would look for this use of the Bible almost entirely within this period of time. It would be an interesting search to discover how far back the Bible has been employed in this way. The list submitted covers scarcely thirty years, and is largely of books printed recently, when books are pouring from the press as never before. It is interesting to know, however, that the first book to bear the imprint of the D. Appleton Company, though not a book of fiction and hence outside the bounds of our search, was designated by the scriptural title *Crumbs from the Master's Table*, written by W. Mason, and printed in 1831.

This method of selecting titles seems to be more in vogue within recent years. Is there not in this at least some slight justification in refuting the charge that the Bible is not opened much nowadays?

Why are some writers using this method to gain titles for their books? Nor for books alone; for poems, magazine articles, and newspaper editorials have often borrowed their captions from the Bible. One answer is that there is, to many, a peculiar power in anything connected with the Scriptures. But this would not be a sufficient reason for those practical people for whom this mysterious and mystical authority does not exist. The truer answer is—the surpassing picturesque expressions to be found in the Bible. Bible words are readily taken in by the mind's eye, since the "picture" is condensed within a brief compass. As in Whistler's drawings, a few lines serve to reveal the large subject.

Bible sentences are usually short and in that brief limit there is often a line or phrase, or even a single word, which at once catches the eye and allures the imagination. Consider, for instance, such compelling phrases as *Time and Chance*, *Madness in the Heart*, *Bread and a Sword*. The Bible has this peculiar quality—short words, quickly grasped because pictorial words—and for this we have largely to thank our Anglo-Saxon translators. Note in the list that a word of more than two syllables is rare, nearly every word is a monosyllable. Such titles are easily caught by the eye and readily retained by the mind.

There is also the opposite reason; something not easily caught, a hidden

meaning in the title which teases the mind and challenges one to buy the book. For example, *A Hind Let Loose*, *Eyeless in Gaza*, *The Last Enemy*.

As a concrete test of these ways of explaining the popularity of Bible words for book titles, try presupposing that some novel which attracts you by its title gets it from the Bible; then use a concordance and be not too amazed to discover your supposition correct. Instances of this test might be *Trumpets of Jubilee*, *Wings of the Morning*, *Prisoners of Hope*.

Another way of testing this method would be to suppose that tomorrow some book were to be published with some such fascinating title as "The Dumb Stone," "Unstable as Water," "A Living Dog and a Dead Lion," "The Skin of His Teeth," "Girded with Firebrands." Actually these are Biblical, and to them many another partial sentence might be added as proof of our thesis.

It were far too much to claim that this is the unique possession of the Bible. Other books and other writers have been used in a similar manner and their words borrowed as titles. Of Shakespeare this is especially true; his lines have been liberally used to lend distinction to the works of others. *This Solid Flesh*, a recent novel by Bradford Smith, and Maxwell Anderson's play, *Both Your Houses*, are in point. There is *Of Mice and Men*, the novel by John Steinbeck, with its book-name from Robert Burns' poem. And such well-known sayings as *Of Thee I Sing*, from the national hymn, is used for a play-title; or *We, the People*, gleaned from the Declaration of Independence by Leo Huberman for his book. But the Bible is of all books ever printed distinctly unique in the large use so made of it; nor is it too much to claim that it is so employed as much as all other books put together.

As pure water would be traced to the original spring, as a gold nugget stirs the prospector to discover whence it came, so is this modern book title method traceable in many cases to the Bible as its original source in purity and value.

Primarily the Bible is a book of religion, a spiritual treatise. It describes itself as a lamp to guided feet and a light for spiritual pathways. In such we think we have eternal life. But the book of the best life is also the book of the best literature. A twofold superiority is under the one cover; like a vigorous bird which uses its two wings to achieve its finest flight. While not unmindful of its highest worth, we can turn our thought to its literary authority. Macaulay may be considered as the spokesman for mil-

lions in his estimate that, if everything else in our language were to be destroyed except the Bible, that book alone would suffice to show the whole extent of the beauty and power of our language. One element of that extent is its ability to cast human emotions into short, terse, concise, picturesque phrases; and one proof of it is the recognition of these qualities by the many writers who have seized upon the Biblical characteristic for brief, startling, attractive words as titles for their books.

In this Christ is supreme! In the words of G. Stanley Hall, "From His day to ours, Jesus has appealed to the literary imagination as no one else has ever begun to do." Of all Biblical words His are the most like some spring of refreshing water from which authors have drunk deeply, whether for spiritual quickening or for titles for their literary output.

"How forcible are right words!" said Job. The right words of our English language are certainly forcibly employed by our writers who have adopted them from the Bible; such have become food for authors—"Thy words were found and I did eat them"; they have become as treasure successfully secured—they "rejoice at thy word as one that findeth great spoil."

There may be those of our day who complain that there is a spiritual apathy, some might even say atrophy, but as one offset to this dirge there is this well-nigh unprecedented popular use of the Bible. Whether or not it may indicate a religious awakening, at least it definitely asserts that of all books the Old and New Testament hold first place in this particular regard.

Many a writer has discovered this to his benefit. Herein he has found words that strike and stick like a perfectly aimed arrow in its target.

MODERN NOVELS AND PLAYS WITH BIBLICAL TITLES

(Arranged according to order of Bible books. Not chronological as to date of publication)

Waters Under the Earth. Martha Ostenso (Genesis 1. 7).

In His Own Image. Frederick W. S. Rolfe (Baron Corvo, pseud.). (Genesis 1. 27.)

The Fruit of the Tree. Edith Wharton (Genesis 3. 3).

The Woman Thou Gavest Me. Hall Caine (Genesis 3. 12).

The Mark of Cain. Harriet Comstock (Genesis 4. 15).

Tubal Cain. Joseph Hergesheimer (Genesis 4. 22).

The Way of All Flesh. Samuel Butler (Genesis 6. 12).

He Sent Forth a Raven. Elizabeth M. Roberts (Genesis 8. 7).

- Seedtime and Harvest.* Fritz Reuter (Genesis 8. 22).
The Bow in the Clouds. Edward Ingram Watkin (Genesis 9. 13).
A Wife Out of Egypt. George C. Lorimer (Genesis 13. 1).
Hagar. Mary Johnston (Genesis 16. 1).
Unleavened Bread. Robert Grant (Genesis 19. 3).
Red Pottage. Mary Cholmondeley (Genesis 25. 30).
The Hands of Esau. Margaret W. Deland (Genesis 27. 22).
Jacob's Ladder. Arthur Train (Genesis 28. 12).
A Hind Let Loose. Charles E. Montague (Genesis 49. 21).
Bricks Without Straw. Albion Tourgée (Exodus 5. 18).
The East Wind. Compton Mackenzie (Exodus 10. 13).
Upon Thy Doorposts. Jennie Rosenholtz (Exodus 12. 7).
The House of Bondage. Reginald W. Kauffman (Exodus 13. 3).
Thou Shalt Not. Elsie Kendrick (Exodus 20. 4).
Graven Image. Margaret Widdemer (Exodus 20. 4).
Day of Atonement. Louis Golding (Leviticus 23. 27).
Trumpet of Jubilee. Ludwig Lewisohn (Leviticus 25. 9).
The Promised Land. Mary Antin (Numbers 14. 40).
The Promised Land. Wladyslaw S. Reymont (Numbers 14. 40).
The Promised Land. Play by Allen Davis (Numbers 14. 40).
The Promised Land. Play by Horace W. Robinson (Numbers 14. 40).
Cities of Refuge. Philip Gibbs (Numbers 35. 6).
Eyeless in Gaza. Aldous Huxley (Judges 16. 21).
The Glory Is Departed. Alexander Lernet-Holenda (1 Samuel 4. 21).
The Lord's Anointed. Ruth E. McKee (1 Samuel 16. 6).
Bread and a Sword. Evelyn Scott (1 Samuel 22. 13).
The Streets of Ascalon. Robert W. Chambers (2 Samuel 1. 20).
Absalom, Absalom! William Faulkner (2 Samuel 19. 4).
My Son, My Son! Howard Spring (2 Samuel 19. 4).
The Prophet's Chamber. Joseph C. Furnas (2 Kings 4. 10).
The House of Rimmon. Henry van Dyke (2 Kings 5. 18).
Thy Servant a Dog. Rudyard Kipling (2 Kings 8. 13).
She Painted Her Face. Dornford Yates (2 Kings 9. 30).
Man's Estate. M. E. Ince (1 Chronicles 17. 17).
Solomon, My Son. John Erskine (1 Chronicles 28. 9).
Rage in Heaven. James Hilton (2 Chronicles 28. 9).
Son of Haman. Louis Cochran (Esther 9. 10).
Skin for Skin. Winifred Duke (Job 2. 4).
Skin for Skin. Llewelyn Powys (Job 2. 4).
Speak to the Earth. Vivienne de Watteville (Job 12. 8).
Hope of a Tree. Play by Leopold Atlas (Job 14. 7).

- The Dwelling Place of Light.* Winston Churchill (Job 38. 19).
Blessed Is the Man. Louis Zara (Psalm 1. 1).
Consider the Heavens. Forest R. Moulton (Psalm 8. 3).
What Is Man? Mark Twain (Psalm 8. 4).
The Fool Hath Said. Beverley Nichols (Psalm 14. 1).
A Goodly Heritage. Mary Ellen Chase (Psalm 16. 6).
Sweeter Than Honey. Arthur Applin (Psalm 19. 10).
Some Trust in Chariots. Fiswoode F. Tarleton (Psalm 20. 7).
Green Pastures. Play by Marc Connelly (Psalm 23. 2).
All the Days of My Life. Amelia Barr (Psalm 23. 6).
They Shall Not Want. Maxine Davis (Psalm 34. 10).
Chaff Before the Wind. Sigurd Christiansen (Psalm 35. 5).
The Green Bay Tree. Louis Bromfield (Psalm 37. 35).
Green Bay Tree. Play by Mordaunt Sharp (Psalm 37. 35).
The Clean Heart. A. S. M. Hutchinson (Psalm 51. 10).
Where No Fear Was. Arthur C. Benson (Psalm 53. 5).
Wings of a Dove. Henry James (Psalm 55. 6).
My Heart and My Flesh. Elizabeth M. Roberts (Psalm 84. 2).
A Watch in the Night. Helen C. White (Psalm 90. 4).
The Snare of the Fowler. Gerald William Bullett (Psalm 91. 3).
Terror by Night. Norman Klein (Psalm 91. 5).
The Strength of the Hills. Ellery H. Clark (Psalm 95. 4).
The Strength of the Hills. Florence Wilkinson (Psalm 95. 4).
Gone With the Wind. Margaret Mitchell (Psalm 103. 16).
Rivers into the Wilderness. Burke MacArthur (Psalm 107. 33).
All Ye People. Merle E. Colby (Psalm 117. 1).
Bottles in the Smoke. Clement Hankey (Psalm 119. 83).
I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes. Herbert Skidmore (Psalm 121. 1).
By the Waters of Babylon. Louis Wallis (Psalm 137. 1).
The Wings of the Morning. Louis Tracy (Psalm 139. 9).
The Seed of the Righteous. F. T. Bullen (Proverbs 11. 21).
The Way of a Transgressor. Negley Farson (Proverbs 13. 15).
Ways of Death. Hans C. Owen (Proverbs 14. 12).
Soft Answer. Patricia Frane (Proverbs 15. 1).
Soft Answers. Richard Aldington (Proverbs 15. 1, adapted).
The Way of an Eagle. Ethel M. Dell (Proverbs 30. 19).
Under the Sun. Grace Flandrau (Ecclesiastes 1. 9).
A Time to Laugh. Rhys Davies (Ecclesiastes 3. 4).
The House of Mirth. Edith Wharton (Ecclesiastes 7. 4).
Laughter of Fools. Idabel Williams (Ecclesiastes 7. 6).
Many Inventions. Rudyard Kipling (Ecclesiastes 7. 29).

- Madness in the Heart.* Edward Donahoe (Ecclesiastes 9. 3).
Time and Chance. Alexander Black (Ecclesiastes 9. 11).
The Tree Falls South. Wellington Roe (Ecclesiastes 11. 3).
The Silver Cord. Play by Sidney Howard (Ecclesiastes 12. 6).
Clear as the Sun. Muriel Hine (Solomon's Song 6. 10).
The Juice of the Pomegranate. Ethel M. Dell (Solomon's Song 8. 2).
Awake and Sing. Play by Clifford Odets (Isaiah 26. 19).
The Shadow of a Great Rock. William R. Lighton (Isaiah 32. 2).
Lamb in His Bosom. Caroline Miller (Isaiah 40. 11).
Hollow of Her Hand. George Barr McCutcheon (Isaiah 40. 12, adapted).
The Cup of Fury. Rupert Hughes (Isaiah 51. 17).
Instead of the Thorn. C. L. Burnham (Isaiah 55. 13).
Beauty for Ashes. Grace Livingston Hill (Isaiah 61. 3).
A Speckled Bird. A. J. Evans (Jeremiah 12. 9).
The Leopard's Spots. Thomas Dixon (Jeremiah 13. 23).
If With All Your Hearts. Louise P. Hauck (Jeremiah 29. 13).
The Parting of the Ways. Theodore E. Apstein (Ezekiel 21. 21).
Breathe Upon These Slain. Evelyn Scott (Ezekiel 37. 9).
Sowing the Wind. Play by Sidney Grundy (Hosea 8. 7).
Reap the Whirlwind. Edith Roberts (Hosea 8. 7).
The Years of the Locust. Gilbert Seldes (Joel 2. 25).
Years of the Locust. A. S. M. Hutchinson (Joel 2. 25).
The Valley of Decision. Edith Wharton (Joel 3. 14).
Valley of Decision. Margaret Flint (Joel 3. 14).
The Tumult and the Shouting. Ursula Parrott (Amos 2. 2).
The Tumult and the Shouting. George Slocombe (Amos 2. 2).
It Shall Be Done Unto You. Lucius Humphrey (Obadiah v. 15).
Jonah's Gourd. Zora N. Hurston (Jonah 4. 6).
Swords Into Ploughshares. Mary Hoxie Jones (Micah 4. 3).
Walk Humbly. Barbara B. Stevens (Micah 6. 8).
Days of Wrath. André Malvaux (Zephaniah 1. 15).
Prisoners of Hope. Mary Johnston (Zechariah 9. 12).
- Where the Young Child Was.* Marie Oemler (Matthew 2. 9).
A Voice in the Wilderness. Grace Livingston Hill (Matthew 3. 3).
By Bread Alone. Ann Ulmer (Matthew 4. 4).
They That Sit in Darkness. John Mackie (Matthew 4. 16).
To the Person Sitting in Darkness. Mary Twain (Matthew 4. 16, adapted).
They Shall Inherit the Earth. Morley Callaghan (Matthew 5. 5).
Salt of the Earth. Cecily Sidgwick (Matthew 5. 13).
Salt of the Earth. Marguerite M. Marshall (Matthew 5. 13).

- An Eye for an Eye.* Clarence Darrow (Matthew 5. 38).
Eye for Eye. Graham Seton (Matthew 5. 38).
Resist Not Evil. Clarence Darrow (Matthew 5. 39).
The Just and the Unjust. Vaughan Kester (Matthew 5. 45).
Rain on the Just. Kathleen Morehouse (Matthew 5. 45).
Give Us This Day. Louis Zara (Matthew 6. 11).
Give Us This Day. Play by Howard Koch (Matthew 6. 11).
Our Daily Bread. Gosta Larsson (Matthew 6. 11).
Our Daily Bread. Play by King Vidor (Matthew 6. 11).
Forgive Us Our Trespases. Lloyd C. Douglas (Matthew 6. 12).
As We Forgive Our Debtors. Play by Tillman Breiseth (Matthew 6. 12).
The Power and the Glory. Gilbert Parker (Matthew 6. 13).
The Power and the Glory. Grace MacGowan Cooke (Matthew 6. 13).
The Power and the Glory. Biography, by Walter Davenport (Matthew 6. 13).
Moth and Rust. Mary Cholmondeley (Matthew 6. 19).
Lily of the Field. Blanche S. Ferguson (Matthew 6. 28).
Strait Gate. Ruth Comfort Mitchell (Matthew 7. 13).
Wide Is the Gate. Loyd Oscar Thompson (Matthew 7. 13).
Figs and Thistles. Albion Tourgee (Matthew 7. 16).
A Few Figs From Thistles. Poems by Edna St. Vincent Millay (Matthew 7. 16).
The Rains Came. Louis Bromfield (Matthew 7. 25, adapted).
Old Wine and New. Warwick Deeping (Matthew 9. 17).
A House Divided. Pearl Buck (Matthew 12. 25).
A Field of Tares. Clotilde Graves (Matthew 13. 25).
Things New and Old. Arnold Bennett (Matthew 13. 52).
Loaves and Fishes. Elaine Myers (Matthew 14. 17).
Red Sky in the Morning. Robert P. Coffin (Matthew 16. 3).
The Child in Their Midst. May Edginton (Matthew 18. 2).
Whosoever Shall Offend. F. Marion Crawford (Matthew 18. 6).
These Twain. Arnold Bennett (Matthew 19. 6).
Whom God Hath Joined. Arnold Bennett (Matthew 19. 6).
From My Youth Up. Margaret E. Sangster (Matthew 19. 20).
The Master of the Vineyard. Myrtle Reed (Matthew 20. 8).
Few Are Chosen. Play by Nora Lawlor (Matthew 22. 14).
The Inside of the Cup. Winston Churchill (Matthew 23. 25).
The Servant in the House. Play by Charles Rann Kennedy (Matthew 24. 45, adapted).
The Foolish Virgin. Thomas Dixon (Matthew 25. 2).
Behold the Bridegroom. Play by George Kelly (Matthew 25. 6).
To Him That Hath. Leroy Scott (Matthew 25. 29).

- To Him That Hath.* Ralph Connor (Matthew 25. 29).
An Alabaster Box. Play by M. E. M. Young (Matthew 26. 7).
The Alabaster Box. Play by Anna J. Harnwell and Isabelle J. Meaker (Matthew 26. 7).
Barabbas. Marie Corelli (Matthew 27. 16).
Son of Thunder. William Brewton (Mark 3. 17, adapted).
First the Blade. Clemence Dane (Mark 4. 28).
Fully Dressed and in His Right Mind. Michael Fessier (Mark 5. 15).
The Seats of the Mighty. Gilbert Parker (Luke 1. 52).
Men of Good Will. Jules Romains (Luke 2. 14).
Kingdoms of the Earth. Margaret Tuttle (Luke 4. 5).
In His Own Country. John Gill (Luke 4. 24).
Children of the Marketplace. Edgar Lee Masters (Luke 7. 32).
Where the Laborers Are Few. Margaret W. Deland (Luke 10. 2).
She Fell Among Thieves. Dornford Yates (Luke 10. 30, adapted).
The Better Part. Lyman P. Powell (Luke 10. 42).
A Certain Rich Man. William Allen White (Luke 12. 16).
To Whom Much Is Given. Lucia T. Mead (Luke 12. 48).
Fire On the Earth. Paul H. Furfey (Luke 12. 49).
More Joy in Heaven. Morley Callaghan (Luke 15. 7).
A Far Country. Winston Churchill (Luke 15. 13).
To Beg I am Ashamed. Sheila Cousins (Luke 16. 3).
Abraham's Bosom. Basil King (Luke 16. 22).
The Power of Darkness. Play by Lyoff (Leo) N. Tolstoy (Luke 22. 53).
Between Two Thieves. Richard Dehan (Luke 23. 33).
The Light That Shines in Darkness. Play by Lyoff (Leo) N. Tolstoy (John 1. 5).
The Wind Bloweth. Donn Byrne (John 3. 8).
The Angel That Troubled the Waters. Thornton Wilder (John 5. 4).
Search the Scriptures. Elizabeth Bacon. (John 5. 39).
The Truth Shall Make You Free. Thomas Masson (John 8. 32).
Night Cometh. Paul C. J. Bourget (John 9. 4).
The Good Shepherd. John Roland (John 10. 11).
If It Die (Si le Grain ne Meurt). André Gide (John 12. 24).
Many Mansions. Play by Jules E. Goodman and Eckert Goodman (John 14. 2).
Greater Love Hath No Man. David P. Allison (John 15. 13).
Behold the Man. Taliaferro Field (John 19. 5).
Men and Brethren. James G. Cozzens (Acts 2. 37).
And Fear Came. John Thompson Whitaker (Acts 2. 43).
The Street Called Straight. Basil King (Acts 9. 11).

- Honourable Estate.* Vera M. Brittain (Acts 13. 50).
Rain From Heaven. Play by Samuel N. Behrman (Acts 14. 17).
To a God Unknown. John Steinbeck (Acts 17, 23, adapted).
The Unknown God. Alfred Noyes (Acts 17. 23).
An Appeal to Caesar. Albion Tourg  e (Acts 25. 11).
South Wind. Norman Douglas (Acts 27. 13).
The Three Taverns. Poems by Edwin Arlington Robinson (Acts 28. 15).
According to the Flesh. A Biography by Fleta C. Springer (Romans 1. 3).
The Wages of Sin. Lucas Malet (Romans 6. 23).
Hath Not the Potter. Maxine Van der Meersch (Romans 9. 21).
Whether There Be Knowledge. Robert Henderson (1 Corinthians 13. 8).
The Last Enemy. Leonard A. G. Strong (1 Corinthians 15. 26).
The Last Enemy. Iris Barry (1 Corinthians 15. 26).
The Last Adam. James G. Cozzens (1 Corinthians 15. 45).
The Old Adam. Arnold Bennett (1 Corinthians 15. 45, adapted).
Of the Earth Earthy. Marion N. Rawson (1 Corinthians 15. 47).
The Savor of Life. Arnold Bennett (2 Corinthians 2. 16).
Not Made With Hands. Helen C. White (2 Corinthians 5. 1).
In the Fulness of Time. Gertrude C. Whitney (Galatians 4. 4).
The Root of Evil. Thomas Dixon (1 Timothy 6. 10).
They Seek a Country. Francis Brett Young (Hebrews 11. 14).
What Manner of Love. Rita Weisman (1 John 3. 1).
The Woman Clothed With the Sun. F. L. Lucas (Revelation 12. 1).
War in Heaven. Philip Parry (Revelation 12. 7).
The Mark of the Beast. Reginald Wright Kauffman (Revelation 16. 2).
The Scarlet Beast. Francis Gerard (Revelation 17. 3).
Gog and Magog. Vincent Sheean (Revelation 20. 8).
No More Sea. Wilson Follett (Revelation 21. 1).

The Church and the World

R. BIRCH HOYLE

LAST year's Ecumenical Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh are being followed up by books from various presses. Some books fasten upon what makes the Church to be a Church. Others focus upon the elements of faith, and the mechanism of ministerial "order." Another group narrate the history of great epochs when the Church faced the world. Yet another group seek to explore the contents of other religions than Christianity, to discover affinities, points of contact, which the missioning Church of Christ may utilize as she seeks to discharge Christ's commission "to preach the gospel to every creature."

We take this last group first. For the next great Ecumenical gathering at Madras at the end of this year gives it priority of importance. A lecture by Professor Heinrich Frick, of Marburg, makes a useful introduction, bearing the title, *Das Evangelium und die Religionen*. This has been rendered into English, under the title, *The Gospel, Christianity, and Other Faiths*, (Blackwell, Oxford). There are three relationships, Doctor Frick says, requiring study: one, between the Gospel and Christianity; another, between Christianity as a religion and other religions; the third, between the Gospel and other religions. To distinguish between the Gospel and Christianity may seem strange to the English-speaking public, yet the glaring disparity between what the "Gospel" enjoins and the outlook and lives of its leaders and agents is marked by non-Christians. The Far East sees too much of "Western-ism" and "American-ism" in missionary methods. The missionary has to carry the Gospel, not western "civilization" (save the mark!). Hanns Lilje has commended Doctor Frick in the *Neue Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift*, as also Doctor Visser't Hooft, in *The Student World*, the latter saying, "It does what most needs doing to clarify our confused thinking." Our Christianity often fails to express the message of the Gospel. Hanns Lilje says, "Our primary duty is not to defend the Gospel or to argue about it or to discuss it, but to witness its power and its teaching." This viewpoint is emerging into prominence. Dr. C. H. Dodd has seen it (in *Apostolic Preaching*) for, to him, "Gospel" indicates what God says and does, while "Christianity" is man's activistic organization.

Barth, in his new volume of *Christian Dogmatics*, puts it as contrast between God's speech in revelation and man's works. "In faith a man hears God; in 'religion' man speaks." (p. 330.) Doctor Frick puts it thus, "How can Christianity be at the same time a unique and incomparable phenomenon (that is, the Gospel) and also be a religion among other religions?"

This viewpoint is prominent in the great book by H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*. (Edinburgh House Press, London.) Archbishop Temple says this work "is likely to remain for many years to come the classical treatment of its theme—perhaps the central theme for Christian thought in this age of multiform bewilderment." In outline the book opens with the three great crises of the present world, in the West with its relativism and false "absolutes" and secularism; in the East where hoary religions meet Western systems of thought; in the Church with its shattered unity, and conflict with the omni-competent State. A chapter discusses "Whither Missions?", the Laymen's Commission *Re-thinking Missions* coming in for sharp criticism—and praise! Two vital chapters deal with The Christian Faith and Ethic, and The Attitude Toward the Non-Christian Religions. In the former, the uniqueness of Biblical Revelation is brought out: the various elements of Christian faith as seen in "Biblical Realism." In the latter the problem of General Revelation and Natural Theology is discussed, and the Barthian thesis "there is no natural theology." Three chapters describe the non-Christian systems of Life and Thought; two chapters outline The Missionary Approach, toward Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Islam, etc. A powerful analysis discriminates between prophetic religions of revelation and naturalistic religions of self-realization; and much of the latter is disclosed as operating in "Christianity," in its mysticism and self-centered ethic, which is "judged" by the "Gospel." Altogether, this book will be *the* textbook on its great theme for many a long day.

What is the "Gospel" that the Church has to witness? We have had a spate of books on the "essence" of the faith, and the flood still runs. Principal J. S. Whale on the radio delivered six addresses early this year on *This Christian Faith* (Student Christian Movement, London). Obviously, only a rough outline was possible in six "talks," yet they cover much ground: Man's Need, facing pain and death; God's Response in providing the Saviour and the witness-bearing Church; the Tension the Christian feels between the demand absolute God lays on him and the "tug" of the world; the Christian Hope of Life Eternal; the Right to Believe. These chapters

throb with life and make a dynamic appeal. The Bishop of Ely has also a book, *This Is Our Faith*, in which he takes up the articles of the Apostles' Creed, explaining them in simple terms for non-theological readers. (Hodder & Stoughton.) Doctor Kraemer's analysis of the "Gospel" content included these elements: Incarnation of God in Christ; Justification by Faith; Reconciliation and Atonement; the Meaning of the Kingdom of God; above all, Revelation, which "is an offense to man, because all philosophy, all idealistic religion, all consistent mystical religion, all moralism meet in one point. They constitute various endeavors for self-redemption, and instinctively reject the truth that God and God alone can work redemption." (p. 70.)

Several good books have appeared explaining the various divisions of Churches within Christendom, the causes and effects of these "splittings." The Bishop of Brechin (Scotland) has edited a volume containing thirty-two papers (each of which can be had separately), entitled *Union of Christendom* (S.P.C.K., London). The aim of the collection is "to get a hearing for the subject of Reunion"; by explaining the Causes of Disruption, through the growth of the Papacy; the collision between the Eastern Churches and Rome; the Reformation Break. A group of papers present The Present Grouping of Christendom; another group deal with representative opinions on The Possibility of a United Christendom, in which while the Easterns, Anglicans, Lutherans, Scandinavian (American), Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationals and Baptists state their views, Rome obstinately refuses to state any other way than that of complete submission to the Papacy. Yet the Romanist view is put by non-Romanists who compile official declarations. Six papers on The Essential Principles of Catholicism, close the volume, the title suggesting the main standpoint from which Anglicans survey this problem. An immense amount of material is put into popular speech to enable readers to understand what each section of Christendom stands for, their history and points of view.

Two very good books dealing with the Reformation have come from The Unicorn Press (London): *The Crisis of the Reformation*, by Dr. Norman Sykes, and *The Influence and Implications of the Reformation*, by the Rev. J. P. Hodges. Canon Sykes, of Liverpool Cathedral, is History Professor in London University; these six chapters furnish a good introduction to the great period when Protestantism emerged. He regards it as a religious revolution, tracing the Causes leading up to the Break; then describ-

ing the Lutheran aspects in Germany and Scandinavia; the Swiss features in Zwingli, Calvin, Scotland; then the Anglican Settlement, and the reaction of Rome in the Counter-Reformation. A final chapter assesses Gain and Loss through that Crisis. One result is that Reformation movements "have been charged with responsibility for the growth of nationalism and the omni-competent modern State"; this Doctor Sykes refutes as well as the charge that modern Capitalism has been largely due to Calvinism.

Mr. Hodges' book is difficult to summarize, it covers so much ground. It has very interesting studies of the influence of the Reformation on learning, freedom, home religion, individualism; especially good in rebutting charges that Puritanism was against music, art, sport. It is most suggestive.

Two leading English students of Christian Sociology, Canon Hudson and Mr. Maurice Reckitt, have compiled the first of two volumes of Materials for the Historical Study of Christian Sociology, under the title, *The Church and the World*. (Allen Unwin, London.) This volume starts with the Old Testament and New Testament teaching as regards the State politics, economics, war, then surveys the Patristic and Medieval periods till the end of the Fourteenth Century. The next volume will cover the past century. Being a catena of extracts of leading thinkers, of necessity the book looks scrappy, and the "joinings" by the compilers, while suggestive, do not supply their own judgments. Still, the extracts, somewhat one-sided, for example, too full of praise for Medievalism and slightly disparaging the Reformation—supply valuable information to students unable to reach large libraries. The theory of The Just Price, The Restraint of Usury, Feudal Ideas of Property; above all, the conflicts between Church and State are amply illustrated and help to an understanding of the present fight against Nationalism as a religion in Germany and Japan today. The prominence of Natural Law in Troeltsch's work needs checking by Brunner's critical notes in *The Divine Imperative*, though, in fairness, one must add that Reinhold Niebuhr's indictment is quoted on p. 231.

The burning point where the Church and the "World" (that is, secularism) clash is to be seen in Germany. Karl Barth at Oxford, when receiving a D.D., lectured on "Trouble and Promise in the Struggle of the Church in Germany" (Oxford University Press). "Two great opponents confront each other, the Church of Jesus Christ and Adolf Hitler's National Socialist State," he says, the latter tempting the former by offering to put the forces of the State, propaganda, radio, money, at the service of the Church if she

will say 1933 was "God's revelation through Hitler." Barth describes the inner conflict within the Church—so many yielding to temptation—so much oppression of those who stand for the Confessional view, that Bible and Creed, not State pressure, should determine the Church's action; so much scorn and defamation of loyalty to Christ. "The particularly distressing condition," says Barth, "is the visibly outbreking activity in all this proceeding of one man who would plant himself in the place of God, and who, then, can consequently assail Christianity till it dies. We have seen him in Russia; more clearly we see him today in Germany." Yet Barth sees Promise even in these clouded days. Men have stood firm; God's glorious Word has fed Faith; Faith has stood the test as "a concrete reality." The lecture appeals to Christendom to be on guard and to help true Christians in Germany.

J. R. Lowell's lines in "The Crisis" remind us, "We see dimly in the present what is small and what is great," and suspension of judgment on Germany may be necessary. Yet a perusal of sixteen booklets in "Theologia Militaus" (Deichertsche Book Publishing Firm, Leipzig) by prominent Lutherans reveals the tension between Paganism and Biblical Christianity, though there is avoidance of Hitler's name by most. Paul Althaus, the Erlangen Professor, has an interesting brochure on "Church and State According to Lutheran Teaching" (No. 4); and a trenchant exposure of "German Faith-Movement," in "Political Christianity" (No. 5) with its fulsome idolatry of "German-dom" and Hitler's role as "the Lord's Anointed." On the whole these Lutheran pamphlets stick close to Scripture; they are more Christian than German, and candidly confess that their special Lutheran "passivism" is largely to blame for the apparent defeat of the Church today. In "Nations" (Völker) "before and after Christ" (No. 14) Althaus said last year, "the supreme need of the German people is for faith. We see in that more than a 'front' against Anti-Christianity; we see the need for faith in Youth, German manhood, and, for a long while back, the Church's need for faith." All the world over, the Church feels weak against the "world." Yet "man's extremity is God's opportunity." "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even faith."

Two Important Books of Theology¹

REVIEWED BY D. C. MACINTOSH

TYPES OF MODERN THEOLOGY is a worthy final volume from the pen of the lamented Professor of Christian Dogmatics in New College, Edinburgh. The book represents in expanded form the Croall Lectures which the author delivered in 1933. In a still earlier form the material of some of the chapters found expression in the Nathaniel Taylor Lectures, given at the Yale Divinity School in 1928. The last twenty-four pages, we are informed, did not receive the author's final revision. The book was prepared for publication and seen through the press by Dr. A. B. Macaulay, the author's associate, years ago, in the translation of the third volume of Ritschl's great work on *Justification and Reconciliation*.

The introductory chapter contains a brief résumé and evaluation of the development of theology from the Reformation to Kant and his immediate successors. Pietism is criticized as having led men "to look inward, not upward," but is credited with having broken the power of Protestant scholasticism and enabled the Christian religion to survive the deluge of rationalistic and skeptical negation which came in later years. Kant is mentioned with appreciation, but it is wrong, the author thinks, to speak of him as "the philosopher of Protestantism"; he is "much more like Erasmus than Luther."

There are two chapters on Schleiermacher, one devoted chiefly to his *Speeches on Religion*, the other to his great theological work, *The Christian Faith*. Doctor Mackintosh would acquit Schleiermacher of the charge of giving for theology a mere phenomenology of the religious consciousness. On the contrary he maintains that what that "father of modern theology" means by religious "feeling," at least in the majority of passages and especially in the *Dogmatic*, is "a laying hold by the soul of a trans-subjective Reality, supreme over the world." Schleiermacher is convicted, however, of having had such a "weak sense of revelation" that "it is only in a relative sense that we can speak of the *Dogmatic* as an authentically Christian book."

¹ *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth*. By Hugh Ross Mackintosh. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$5.00.

² *Legacy of a Christian Mind: John McLeod Campbell, Eminent Contributor to Theological Thought*. By Eugene Garrett Bewkes. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. \$2.00.

Hegel is blamed for making philosophy instead of supernatural revelation the ultimate test of religious truth. Considerable attention is given the left-wing Hegelianism of Strauss and Feuerbach, while even at its best Hegelianism is charged with tending to substitute an ambiguously personal or impersonal Absolute for what Christian faith means by God.

With Ritschlianism, especially as it appears in Herrmann, Haering and Kaftan, Doctor Mackintosh is more sympathetic; but as for Ritschl himself, "at a vital point," it is claimed, he "failed to keep touch with the New Testament." While "to the apostles 'reconciliation' is something God has done, in virtue of which the sinful can come to be right with Him, to Ritschl reconciliation is an experience of man." (But, freely granting that God has indeed taken the initiative toward reconciliation, we would ask, Must not the reconciliation, if it is to be complete or even a reality, be made real in the experience of man, in and through his repentance and faith?)

Troeltsch, systematic theologian of the religio-historical school, is blamed for his extreme historical relativism, for having given up any belief in special (miraculous?) revelation, and for his doubt as to the universal validity and essential finality of the Christian religion. "Under the somber influences of Germany's anguish in years subsequent to the Great War he gave expression to what must be regarded as a gravely and even fatally diluted version of Christian faith. Yet this may well have been a passing phase. . . . From many an earlier page of Troeltsch we can glean utterances of a deep and manly confidence in God which, had his life been prolonged, might well have recaptured the note of steadfast certainty."

Kierkegaard is criticized as carrying his one-sided emphasis upon the transcendence of God almost to the verge of a pagan pessimistic agnosticism; the chief value of his work is found in the "clear, even if occasionally strident and hysterical, note of warning which he sounded for theologians as a class," the warning against over-anxiety to bring faith and speculative philosophy into agreement. "Religion has too often declined into a temper in which we inspect God, are on easy terms with Him, or employ Him as a theoretical hypothesis. On this sort of humanistic folly . . . Kierkegaard has said the last word."

The final chapter is on Karl Barth and "the theology of the Word of God." Here the treatment is remarkably sympathetic, especially with the more recent phases of the Swiss theologian's thought. Barth's message is held to be "of incalculable import for the Church of our time." Here again,

it is evident, the idea of miraculous revelation, given once for all and permanently authoritative, tends to be made the dominant consideration.

The book is well worth a careful reading, but one would have liked to have found in it further light as to how and by what criteria revelation is to be recognized as such. Obviously the Fundamentalist criterion of mere inclusion in the Bible is not meant to be the test; it is made clear enough that not everything in the Bible is to be taken as word of God. But just what is the true criterion, and why, especially in a former near-Ritschlian, is there that strange reluctance to specify spiritual value as a clue to the divine in the human? Is miracle an adequate criterion of a work or word of God? What indeed is the criterion by means of which we shall be able to recognize the miracle, if and when it does happen, and as a matter of fact are we not surer of revelation than, as critical thinkers, we can ever be of miracles? Just here too is where one could wish for an *Auseinandersetzung* with Barth himself. To appeal to revelation as the true norm of faith and to faith as containing within itself the whole criterion of revelation is to go around in circles and get nowhere. Shall we appeal simply to intuition, or to subjective religious feeling? There are intuitions many, as there are faiths many, and who can say that any of them is infallible? As for religious feelings their name is *legion*, and they speak with no united voice. This is not to deny either the indispensable value or the chronological priority of subjective faith, with its accompanying intuitions and feelings; but what we are concerned about is critical reassurance that what faith has intuitively felt to be revelation is such in very truth. And here noncontradiction of objectively known facts, promotion of universally valid spiritual value, and harmonious inclusion within a reasonable metaphysical system all have their contribution to make; but most conclusive of all, in our judgment, is the progressive objective verification of the intuitive faith in religious experience, where what is meant by religious experience is no mere subjective emotion but an objectively observable change of will, conduct and character, conditioned in an essentially dependable way by a specifically religious adjustment. From this point of view, while the merely subjective certitude of faith or intuition may, if it happens to be true, be conceded to be insight, it is the objectively tested and validated certainty that a reality which is divine in its spiritual value and religious functioning has been discovered and can presumably be discovered in essentially the same way by others, that is alone entitled to be called revelation in the full sense of the term. (I have been harping upon this

string, with little apparent effect, for well-nigh twenty years, and I have no doubt that most of my few readers are tired of the frequent repetition of the same old note. But they may as well admit at least the probable truth of the contention, first as last, particularly if they consider themselves Christians, since, if the statement made be not true, Christianity has no true gospel of salvation through faith for the life which now is, and if it has none for the life which now is, it probably has none for the life which is to come.)

In his introductory chapter Doctor Mackintosh remarks that to a patriotic Briton there may appear to be some humiliation in the fact that, throughout such a study as he has undertaken here, nothing or next to nothing is said regarding any British or even any wider Anglo-Saxon contribution to doctrinal history. "The air is mostly filled with German names." A partial explanation of this fact is attempted—with perhaps only partial success. Furthermore, the theological reader is unlikely to have any previous favorable opinion of British theology appreciably enhanced when he is reminded by the writer of the second book under review here that in an earlier work the late Professor Mackintosh ventured the opinion that J. McLeod Campbell is "the greatest of all Scottish theologians," for in the minds of most to whom the name McLeod Campbell is at all known it is associated with a curious and seemingly quite indefensible doctrine of atonement through a supposed vicarious penitence on the part of the sinless Christ. But in a new book, based upon a doctoral dissertation written at Edinburgh under Professor Mackintosh's supervision, Professor Eugene Bewkes of Colgate University undertakes to correct, as a serious misapprehension, this prevailing opinion as to Campbell's significance (or insignificance!), and to substantiate the judgment that in Campbell we have to do with "one of the greatest spiritual minds of the nineteenth century, who has not been sufficiently remembered in the twentieth." And it must be admitted, I think, that, in spite of what may seem at first an overanxiety to vindicate Campbell in the judgment of theologians today, Doctor Bewkes has achieved in this bold undertaking a very considerable measure of success. At any rate the result is a spirited and highly interesting book, well worth the theologian's attention, and one in which the writer's own flair for theological discussion is made amply manifest.

The common understanding as to Campbell's theory of the saving work of Christ goes back principally to certain expressions which appear for the most part in Chapter VI of his principal work, *The Nature of the Atonement*.

ment. Here Christ's intercession for sinful humanity, beginning of necessity with a confession of our sins, is spoken of as having in it "all the elements of a perfect repentance in humanity for all the sin of man—a perfect sorrow—a perfect contrition—all the elements of such a repentance, and that in absolute perfection, all—except the personal consciousness of sin," so that "in relation to sin the wrath of God is rightly met, and that is accorded to divine justice which is its due, and could alone satisfy it." In this way, Campbell claims, the only alternative to an equivalent punishment for sin was provided, namely, an equivalent sorrow and repentance, and therewith "a moral and spiritual expiation for sin," "securing the vindication of the majesty and justice of God in pardoning sin." By Christ's true and righteous confession of humanity's sinfulness, uttered in humanity, "righteousness as in God was satisfied, and demanded no more than righteousness as in Christ thus presented." In this way what is called Christ's "expiatory and atoning confession of our sins" is supposed to be established and vindicated.

It must not be forgotten, however, that in Chapter VII of *The Nature of the Atonement* it is claimed that this "due and perfect expiation" for our sin is *offered* to us as a basis for our forgiveness "with the prospective purpose that it is to be reproduced in us." "The expiatory confession of our sins . . . is to be shared in by ourselves." Furthermore, in an important note to Chapter VI, appended to the second edition and reproduced in all subsequent ones, it is explicitly denied that "what Christ felt and confessed to the Father" was "a substitute for repentance in us." Repentance, it is there insisted, is impossible to the sinner "*only apart from Christ.*" "To man as related to Christ repentance is possible," and that word repentance "will have its full meaning in the personal experience of every one who accepts in faith the atonement."

It would seem then that there is something to be said for Doctor Bewkes's contention that what Campbell meant to teach was "that Christ does not repent *for us*, and certainly not for Himself," but that "He has feelings of the divine mind which, when reproduced in us, cause us to repent." But this relatively simple meaning is surely not all that Campbell was trying to express, and it can hardly be denied not only that his language is at times extremely clumsy and confusing, but that his own mind was still somewhat confused, as he groped his pioneering way toward that thoroughly rational and ethical theory of reconciliation with God to which he perhaps never quite attained. Trouble was made for him by the obligation he felt to pour the

new wine of the gospel of the perfectly moral character and attitude of God into the old wineskins of certain Pauline forms of thought and speech. But, as the present reviewer has ventured elsewhere to maintain (*Crozer Quarterly*, January, 1931), Paul himself made the same mistake when he tried to compress the Christian Gospel of the gracious divine initiative within the limits of the traditional concept of propitiatory sacrifice. The result is the self-contradictory notion of a God already propitious enough to provide the propitiatory offering which is to propitiate Himself. (Contrast Romans 3. 25 with 2 Corinthians 5. 19.) This is markedly similar in method and the unsatisfactoriness of the result to what we find in Campbell, as also in the *Forgiveness and Law* of his contemporary, Bushnell.

There was no such confusion in the straightforward ethical thinking of Jesus on the subject of forgiveness (Luke 17. 3; Matthew 18. 21, 22; Luke 15. 11-32; 23. 34; Luke 6. 36, 37; Matthew 6. 14, 15; Mark 11. 25, 26). There was much of "the mind of Christ in Paul," but there was also, along with the new "freedom of the Spirit," a lurking remnant of the scribal bondage to the letter. And the tragedy of the history of the Christian doctrine of the atoning work of Christ is that through an essentially pre-Christian bondage to the letter it has been the pre-Christian element in Paul's thought, that of propitiatory sacrifice, which has been made normative through the centuries, instead of the message of Jesus that there is not and never has been anything to keep the God of perfect righteousness and grace from forgiving the sincerely repentant sinner for whose reconciliation with Himself He has from time immemorial been taking the initiative. And if, dissatisfied with a thoroughly ethical doctrine of the atonement, we seek to return to the groping thought of a pioneer like J. McLeod Campbell, the chances are that we shall succeed only in confusing and corrupting our moral view of the dealings of God with men. For the characteristic thing in Campbell's thought *in his own day*, that in which he differed from others, was the ethical element in his theory; but the characteristic thing in his doctrine *in our day*, that is, as contrasted with a modern ethical view, is just that which later thought has rightly transcended.

Book Reviews

The Mission and Message of Jesus.

An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research. By H. D. A. MAJOR, T. W. MANSON and C. J. WRIGHT. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc. \$5.00.

THIS lengthy volume by three well-known scholars, it is safe to affirm, will be of the highest value to those who desire a sound knowledge of the gospel narrative. This is suggested in the Editorial Preface—"The authors conceive it to be their business to make a selection of what they consider is best worth knowing about the Gospels." Thus they practically address themselves to serious readers but not to specialists. The book, we venture to say, is one to be kept for frequent reference rather than to be read continuously from cover to cover. It will well repay the earnest student to possess it. Here are three invaluable volumes. The first, by Doctor Major, is on *The Incidents in the Life of Jesus*. Doctor Manson writes on *The Sayings of Jesus*. These two deal with the Synoptic Gospels, and the third book, by Doctor Wright, is devoted to the Gospel according to Saint John. The Gospel of Saint Mark is admirably defined in this suggested heading

MY YEAR WITH THE LORD JESUS

The Reminiscences of Saint Peter, His Chief Apostle, Reported and Translated by his Dragoman John Mark for the Christians in Rome.

Each incident is recorded with parallels from the other evangelists, and the various textual variations are plainly noticed. Doctor Manson's introductory remarks

to Part II are excellent and only want of space forbids one to dilate upon them. Here it must be sufficient to dwell on a single point, namely, the religion of Jesus Christ was propagated by a group of men brought up in crass ignorance and abject indigence. This is refuted by the fact that in the first century of our era Judaism was professed by a people who had been carefully trained in their numerous schools, and that the disciples had forsaken all in order to follow their Master. This is most adequately discussed by the author of Part II. Part III, dealing with the Fourth Gospel, shows much sympathy and insight. Doctor Wright justifies throughout his own words, "No one can understand Jesus without some likeness, however feeble, to Him. Likewise no one can understand the Fourth Evangelist without some spiritual kinship with him, and some insight into the historical situation he was confronting."

Doctor Major has done his part as editor well and has secured excellent co-operators. It says much for English theologians that in these days such a work should have seen the light. A work dealing with the Mission and Message of Jesus might be expected to be addressed to a public which would demand that a serious topic like the Synoptic Problem should be overloaded with learned matter, or one which should endeavor to attract by its superficial sentimentality. Both these extremes have been avoided and this book is a monument of what English scholarship is capable when the teachers of the ministry are working in friendly co-operation.

F. J. FOAKES JACKSON.
Englewood, New Jersey.

The Magnet of the Heart. By ROBERT MENZIES. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

The Power of God. By KARL HEIM. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.25.

THE addresses of Doctor Menzies are evangelistic in character. He writes in the preface: "I have aimed at presenting the Gospel in such a way as to evoke personal allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ." He adheres to this purpose with remarkable tenacity. The sermons are grouped under the following headings: The Significance of Jesus, His Exclusive Claims, His Benefits, His Challenges and His Offers. These titles suggest the general theme of the message presented.

But these are not the ordinary type of evangelistic sermons. They are rich in content as well as filled with passion. They are not what is sometimes called "simple gospel messages." In one sermon, for instance, I counted five poetic references—two of them from Browning and one from Milton. In the same sermon, he also quoted such distinguished scholars as Deissmann and others like him. In addition to this, he made reference to men like Robert Louis Stevenson, Heyler, Rainy, Michelet and Doctor Johnson. These are some of the rich resources upon which the preacher has drawn to make his evangelism reach the mind as well as the heart.

Before reading the sermons in *The Power of God*, I turned to the article in the current Winter Number of *RELIGION IN LIFE* entitled, "An Interpretation of Karl Heim." There I learned that Doctor Kerr, a former student of this preacher, linked his name with that of Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. Then he wrote concerning the three of them: "They are the great triumvirate in theology today."

With this appraisal of Heim as one of the very great theologians of our time, I began to read these sermons. Frankly, I rather expected to find them ponderous if not heavy, and most certainly calling for very close and attentive reading. The sermons are the work of a great theologian—that is clear from first to last. But they reveal the enviable capacity of a great mind to express itself in language which is simple, clear and lucid. There are striking figures of speech here and there which suggest the deeper and possibly inexpressible truth. Even "the common people" would have little difficulty in grasping the message the preacher intends to convey. One can easily imagine that as these sermons were preached "the hungry sheep looked up" and knew that they were being "fed."

This paragraph may not constitute a review of these excellent sermons but it is a tribute to the preacher who is at once deeply profound and easily comprehended.

HORACE G. SMITH.

President of
Garrett Biblical Institute.

Doctrine in the Church of England.

Commission on Christian Doctrine,
Appointed by the Archbishops of
Canterbury and York. New York:
The Macmillan Company. \$1.75.

THIS is the report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. The report is signed by twenty of the foremost scholars of the Church of England.

The purpose of the Commission was to effect a reconciliation between the different schools of thought in the Church, the Evangelical, the Catholic and the Modernist.

The result is a compromise, and as is usual is not fully satisfying to either party. The Modernist has gained much

comfort, in the suggestion that a shorter creed might be adopted by the Church and that belief in the virgin birth and the physical resurrection of Jesus is not to be required as essentials of faith. He also gains in the statement that the doctrines of scripture and of the Church must be in harmony with the facts of science and not contrary to reason. The miracles of the Bible are to be judged in the light of the tendency to associate abnormal events with religious leaders, and that in consequence it is impossible in the present state of knowledge to make the same evidential use of the narratives of miracles in the Gospels which appeared possible in the past. This is a religious gain, in as much as the use of miracles to form belief appears to have been deliberately rejected by our Lord.

The traditionalist or Catholic churchman is dissatisfied by the liberal interpretation of orders and sacraments in the report. While the high church doctrine is recognized as having valid standing, yet in the Holy Communion the Zwinglian doctrine of receptionism is also recognized as valid. In the matter of orders the report follows the Lambeth quadrilateral, and recognizes the validity of non-Episcopal orders and sacraments.

The chief importance of this report is that an Official Commission after fifteen years of thought, reading and argument *inter se* has in a momentous Document told the Church of England and the religious world everywhere what grounds exist for its faith and practice.

The Commission points out that it possessed neither executive nor judicial power; but in fact nothing can be quite the same again in Anglican theology after the deliberations of so eminent a body convoked by the Primate of the English Church. Members of the Church of England will regard their own positions

as admissible or otherwise, largely according to its relation to this report.

While this report will stimulate controversy, yet there is evidence of a deep sympathetic interaction between the scholars of different schools of thought, and a new effort to justify the age-long position of a Bridge-Church, and the bridges may lead in many directions under the Holy Spirit.

ROBERT ROGERS.

Church of the Good Shepherd,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

What Has Christianity to Say? By F. R. BARRY. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.00.

DOCTOR BARRY has produced a constructive discussion of the Christian faith, and its place in contemporary life. Based upon profound scholarship, it is popular in the best sense, being of equal value to laymen and ministers. It is a guidebook for those who, journeying through the tangled maze of modern life, would find spiritual direction. It is not a dull and prosaic marking of the trail, but a human interest guidebook written with imagination, one that lures us on in the way and quickens interest in the high adventure of living.

The inspiration and theme of the volume are from a quotation from *The Bible View of Life*, by the Dean of Exeter: "There is something that the Bible has to say, and it has become during the last two generations much more clear than it used to be; it is the kind of message desperately needed now. The Bible stands for belief in God and belief in man. These are the two golden keys with which the door into the future will be unlocked.

"The heresies of the twentieth century are economic, moral and political rather

than speculative and metaphysical," says our author. He urges strongly that these heresies be met with a well-thought-out theology that shall put the State in its place as secondary to God and human values; and also that the fatalism and cynicism of the contemporary scene be met with a strong faith in the changeless values of the eternal God.

Following out the idea of the two keys, Doctor Barry in two brilliant chapters sets forth a strong doctrine of God, based upon the Bible and some of the best present day insights; and to this he ties a high spiritual conception of man. "Man is still emergent, still unfulfilled, still conditioned by nature and history; but fashioned in the divine image, called to a spiritual and eternal destiny to receive through Christ the privilege of sons, and citizenship in the Heavenly Father's kingdom. No earthly state can claim man's whole allegiance, for he is an inheritor of the kingdom of God. He may not be treated as means or instrument, for he is of infinite worth in God's sight. The sacredness of persons is God's great gift to man."

In a later chapter Doctor Barry urges the creation of standards of Christian thinking and living that shall meet the needs of today. He knows that these standards cannot be final, fixed or dogmatic. "The Christian standard is the vital principle of creative moral growth and discovery, both for society and for individuals. In Christ we know what God's purpose is; but we have yet to learn its full meaning, and this we shall never do in time and space." There will be frustrations, difficulties, and temptations to compromise. But "we must do the honest best that can be done, trusting in God and surrendered to His will, and believing that it is His will to work not only through the Church and its ministries, but

also through the broad sweep of history. For the world is God's, and through all He is sovereign."

This excellent volume is heartening and suggestive. It is a book to be read again and again, and each reading will yield its full measure of riches.

SIDNEY A. GUTHRIE.

First Methodist Episcopal Church,
Galesburg, Illinois.

Living Religion. By HORNELL HART.
New York: The Abingdon Press.
\$1.50.

It is a much easier task to analyze the problems of our contemporary situation and their relationship to Christian living than it is to suggest practical methods for directing one's personal action toward the Christian ideal. Dr. Hornell Hart in this book has attempted this latter task and points out techniques for making religion a living force in an individual life.

He suggests the approach through meditation. He makes clear the steps for true meditation, such as relaxation, invocation, meditation proper, illumination and application. He warns, however, "Never accept any alleged inspiration as infallible. The results of meditation must be regarded merely as hypotheses, to be tested and to be proved in the light of the accumulated wisdom of mankind by practical, open-minded experimentation."

He believes and insists, "Meditation must lead to action. The insights that come from moments of contemplation and illumination in a flood of energy must be applied to the problems for which they are needed, if the spiritual contacts are to be maintained and strengthened."

With this warning and with this insight on the completion of meditation, Doctor Hart suggests that a personal and social problem may be clearly analyzed

and a constructive plan of action evolved which otherwise would be impossible of achievement. It is his thought that real Christian living can be obtained if a person will sit down and objectively and dispassionately view the causes of his conflict with forces outside himself or with other people. It is not by belligerently attacking another point of view that a constructive program of action is achieved, but by trying to understand it and the reasons which produce it. In this way, opposite points of view are used not to check each other but to supplement each other. The result is far more important than arriving at the least common denominator. Instead, a basis is produced for mutual understanding and concerted action.

No one can read the book without feeling that Doctor Hart is close to the sources of a dynamic religion. However, many may question the adequacy of this program for all types of social and personal problems. Because of his insistence upon objectivity and dispassionate viewing of problems of the world, Doctor Hart seems to minimize the emotional drive that comes from an intense religious conviction. Passion for a religious life cannot always be rationalized nor brought under the complete control of contemplation or meditation, either in a Saint Peter, or Paul, or a modern disciple. The conflict between the impulsive action of the prophets and the persuasive influence of the mystics has not been adequately answered. The scale seems to be weighted in favor of the force of "leaven" in society rather than the explosive power of an uncompromising religion. A synthesis of both points of view probably would be more accurate. However, the book is an adequate antidote to zealots who feel that impulsive action is alone the Christian way.

Here is combined the deep quietism of

the Friends with their concern for social action into a practical program for Christian living. That is the book's greatest service. It can be used by either a layman or a pastor who wishes an answer to the question, "How can I make my religion more vital in my everyday living and find the source of power to live as I pray?"

IVAN M. GOULD.

International Council
of Religious Education.

Recoveries in Religion. By RALPH W. SOCKMAN. Nashville: The Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

STYLES in preaching change as rapidly and for about the same reasons as do styles in dress. The early preachers of our American church life very definitely possessed a pattern identified with the period in which they uttered their message. Yet through every era and in every changing expression there is the central and continuing reality. Preaching is an art. It is the art of giving expression to the Eternal in time.

Ralph W. Sockman is one of our contemporary preachers who is making a definite impression upon our generation. He is not a homiletic "weathercock," but an authentic "guidepost." He is not lost in the midst of the sophistications of our pagan modernity. He knows the way through. So in his recent volume, that grew out of the Quilliam Lectures at Emory University, he casts up the assets and liabilities in *Recoveries in Religion*.

This preacher is not afraid of his world. He has an interpretation of its life greater than any of its difficulties. He is aware of the ineffectual uncertainties that obtain in many quarters. In epigrammatic fashion and with a lively command of clear language he helps the ages speak to our age. He knows the need

for an enlarging sense of history that will make the Church a matter of more serious concern in the thinking of today.

"No person can enter into the amplitude of a Christian experience unless he thinks of this vast inheritance of the ages. There is a certain shortsightedness, if not silliness, in the popular mood which sneers at the Church while it pretends to exalt the Christ. Our generation would not even know of Jesus had it not been for the Church, which it is the vogue to condemn."

There is a vitality in these pages that speaks of a dynamic quality. It is not that the writer is an intense "activist." He knows that action grows out of one's notion of things. Hence when his words are most vigorous one is aware of a deep poise and quiet strength.

Never does he surrender to the hackneyed or stereotyped. The inner emotions and concepts are always disclosed by an adequate phrase. Accurately he describes the modern city dweller seeking security:

"Surrounded by a society of polite hostilities where every stranger is viewed as a potential enemy, dwelling amid the false fronts put up to conceal the tawdry interiors of life, living on the defensive and under the strain of pretense, we naturally crave the element of security in some sectors of our existence. Hence we relish it in our religion."

This book is of one piece. It is an artistic fabric. It has a unity of purpose and its motif can be found and followed. The writer is a Christian realist who knows that "the religious leaders of our day have made a creditable record in their reaction from the opiates of old orthodoxy and the excessive optimism of recent liberalism."

But its best quality lies in the fact that it sustains a high loyalty to a purpose. This is a book that is written not for the sake of writing a book. It has an objective. Ralph Sockman is a man who is at the task of propagating faith. He wants his fellows to explore with him the grace of God. Living a modern life in a modern city he demonstrates that the experience of the Christian purpose can and does triumph.

OSCAR THOMAS OLSON.

Epworth-Euclid Church,
Cleveland, Ohio.

The Riddle of the World. By DAVID S. CAIRNS. New York: The Round Table Press. \$3.00.

THOSE who have read the former books by Doctor Cairns, especially his *Reasonableness of the Christian Faith* and *The Faith That Rebels*, the latter of which is a sincere and illuminating treatment of the miracles of Jesus, will come to this most recent of his writings with real zest. This high anticipation will not be disappointed.

Every page of the volume shows not only honest, competent scholarship but that spirit, for which the author has become noted, of looking with all possible objectivity at controversial questions, not only in Great Britain but throughout the English-speaking world.

Doctor Cairns, in the present volume, undertakes to write not for the technical theologian but for "that large body of educated men and women in all social classes who are interested in things of the Spirit." His suggestion that theologians, by taking pains, could "make their theme intelligible to a much wider public" is a very wise and timely one to make to several modern theologians. In this volume he has taken his own medicine and has

produced a work that will be both interesting and intelligible to any earnest person of ordinary education who wants to find the central meaning of our interesting world.

The treatment of Humanism, especially in its American phase, is generous, kindly, and completely satisfying. It is made clear that in America in particular there are two distinct schools of those who are usually grouped as Humanists. A quite necessary distinction is drawn between the teaching of Irving Babbitt and John Dewey, for instance. The author's concern in the present volume is with the latter group which would think of humanity as distinct from God as the true object of man's reverence and love. To those disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ who have been confused and at the same time properly attracted by the humanitarianism of our Western humanists one would commend the quiet, generous treatment accorded some of these modern teachers of non-theistic Humanism in these Baird lectures.

Our author pays his respects to those who would quiet our intellectual craving and heart-hunger for a God of understanding loving-kindness by calling this "wishful thinking." "I am acutely aware," he says, "that there is something deeply *irrational* in that one's construction of thought which says there is no meaning in the universe, no end to which it moves, though there are causes that impel its mighty course."

The closing chapter, "The Substance of the Faith," is a fitting conclusion to a volume which is full of close reasoning and is also a confession of faith of one who has thought and served bravely and well.

While one rejoices in the satisfying fashion in which every chapter is treated, it is in particular in "Humanism,"

"Science and Religion," "The Moral Pathway to Reality" that the mature wisdom of this wise saint of God appears in its most attractive form. The Christian thought and action of our time will be both greatly clarified and invigorated if this book receives the attention which it so richly deserves both from the clergy and the laity.

GEORGE IRVING.

Board of Christian Education of
The Presbyterian Church in the
United States of America.

Prayer and Worship. By DOUGLAS V. STEERE. The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, Inc. Distributed by the Association Press. 50 cents.

THE Associate Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College has added to the Hazen Books on Religion another striking little volume. Its limits of space are determined by the prescribed pattern of the series, but it loses nothing by its brevity. The classical pattern of liturgical prayer is the collect—a single closely-wrought and swift sentence, which moves as "a sharp dart of longing love." The classical book on prayer might well aspire to a similar brevity rather than to encyclopedic dimensions.

In reading Catholic books about the life of Christian devotion one is often struck by their realism. They deal with things of the spirit in what seems to us as a rather matter-of-fact manner. They sometimes seem lacking in the very quality of devoutness which they profess to celebrate. Yet they are right. If the themes to which they address themselves are aspects of reality, their authors need not be tentative or self-conscious in their approach. They can and should move as if one were walking on granite, not wallowing in a bog.

By contrast, Protestant works about the devotional life too often strike one as soft and sentimental. An affectation of devoutness and spirituality is felt as a thin veneer of piety covering an ultimate agnosticism, if not candid skepticism. They suggest a studied pose rather than an honest and fearless correspondence to a given "is-ness" in things.

The excellence of Douglas Steere's little book on prayer is, before all else, a matter of initial attitude toward its theme. The Society of Friends is, by common consent, one of the most idealistic of our Christian communions. It is, at the same time, one of the least sentimental of those communions. It dares to treat the world of the spirit as being ultimately the only important matter of fact in the universe. Therefore it can afford to dispense with a purely decorative devotion which is little more than a decent veil for stubborn doubt or pious muddleheadedness. Douglas Steere has caught this quality of the mental tempers of the Society with which he has cast his Christian lot. We are reassured to find a man writing with such confidence of a theme which is too often treated, among us, as a theological hypothesis, or a holy mystery too sacred to be discussed descriptively or analytically. In much of what he has to say about prayer there is precisely that disarming and utterly convincing homeliness which we so gladly recognize in the work of his predecessor and master, Rufus Jones.

More specifically, he treats in brief detail of both the practice of private prayer and the conduct of public worship. Within these two subjects he discusses the traditional divisions of prayer as adoration, confession, thanksgiving, petition and intercession. He does not profess to pluck the heart out of the mystery; that would be presumption. But neither is he

afraid of his themes. He moves surely and reassuringly through the several "departments" of prayer, and manfully avoids evading a problem, which he has to admit no man can solve, by describing all prayer as "orison" and equating it with the whole reflective side of the religious life. There is a final suggestive and useful chapter on "Devotional Reading." Altogether this little book is an honest and technically skillful response to the age-old demand, "Teach us how to pray."

WILLARD L. SPERRY.

The Memorial Church,
Harvard University.

The Bible and Its Literary Associations. By MARGARET B. CROOK and Other Members of the Faculty of Smith College. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.50.

It is paradoxical that at a time when more is known about the Bible than has ever been known before, the Bible itself has become so unfamiliar to hosts of educated people as to be practically unknown to many except by reputation. Witness the Congressional Record. Daniel Webster and his contemporaries could illustrate their themes and point the applications of them with Biblical allusions and be sure that their constituents would understand them, but they could not do so if they were speaking today. As for our colleges and universities, the cry goes up from many an English Department that the greatest prose and poetry of our language are unappreciated by students because the Biblical phraseology in which both are steeped is no longer intelligible to them.

In so far as modern neglect of the Bible is due to the growing secularization of modern society, nothing short of

a widespread return to religion can remedy it. In so far as it is due to mistaken and untenable theories of the nature of its inspiration which have been held in the past and are now outgrown, the great definitions of inspiration which have been made by the Second World Conference on Faith and Order and the Anglican Commission on Christian Doctrine may be counted upon to help. But in so far as it is due to sheer ignorance of the importance of the Bible as literature, and of its effect upon literature, the remedy must be educational, and can come most effectively from our colleges. It is because their work along these lines is so effective, so adequate in design, comprehensive in scope, and trenchant in execution, that the outline of the literary history of the Bible which Miss Crook and her colleagues have prepared is to be welcomed as a contribution of great importance. It would be difficult to name another book in this field which covers so much ground and covers it so well.

Although the book is a symposium, and gains thereby the services of specialists such as Professor Mensel on the Bible in German and Doctor Dunn on the Bible in England in the Sixteenth Century, the fact that half of it is written and the whole edited by one person preserves its essential unity. For that matter, the Bible itself is a symposium, and so is the story of its acceptance by the Western world and incorporation into the very substance of which their literatures are made. The Bible itself is the hero of the story, as the Nile is of Emil Ludwig's, and again the reader follows an impersonal hero through a fascinating pilgrimage, from Semitic sources in the fateful strife of the Hebrew prophets against polytheism and idolatry, through rich accessions from the thought of Greece, to a delta so vast that every literature of conse-

quence to the Western world has been fertilized by it as by no other agency: the Bible is our literary Nile.

We are prepared to find this to be the case with poets like John Milton, and Dean Nicolson's account of it, though more than ordinarily interesting, does not take the reader by surprise. But when Dr. Mary Ellen Chase reveals the extent to which the King James Version of the Bible has influenced the writings of Thomas De Quincey, greatest essayist of his century, and those of its all but greatest novelist, Thomas Hardy, it is likely that the writer will be very much surprised, and charmed as well by the felicity of the references. These are among the most memorable chapters of a memorable book; and to them must be added a chapter by President Neilson on the Scottish Psalter, a book which has been an intimate part of the life of Scotland for nearly three centuries. The author recalls communion Sabbaths when "the sole medium for the articulate expression of the feeling of times like these was the 'Psalms of David in Metre,' and they sufficed."

HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS.

General Theological Seminary.

The New Testament. A New Translation from the Original Greek. By FRANCIS ALOYSIUS SPENCER. Edited by Charles J. Callen and John A. McHugh. The First Catholic Translation Made in America. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.50.

IF this publication does nothing else but dispel the error that the Catholic Church is in principle opposed to Bible reading, it will serve a needed and worthy purpose. It possesses qualities that are calculated to make its reading popular,

which comports with the expressed intention of the translator to provide for the faithful a text which they could read with ease and pleasure so that the inspired word should become more widely read. The size, type and light paper make it a handy volume; and it is no exaggeration to say that the articulation of the page is more modern and more pleasing than that of any other New Testament on the market.

But it has many other commendable qualities. It is based on the original Greek text. The Rheims or Douay Version of 1582 was based on the Latin Vulgate, even when it differed from the original Greek. Fr. Spencer takes a bold forward step in Biblical scholarship in leaving the Vulgate, which is the authoritative version of the Catholic Church, to its place in liturgy and doctrine, but adopts the Greek original as the basis of the English version. This is an innovation, but in accord with Saint Jerome's example and evidently with the approval of highest Catholic authority, which has given its *imprimatur* to the new version.

But a true translation must also be based upon a text that is free from errors of transcription which creep in unawares in the act of copying by hand, and it must be a faithful rendering of the thought of the original. Fr. Spencer has proven himself a competent scholar in both. His English is praiseworthy, being free from both the vulgar and pedantic and in harmony with its lofty theme. We meet with a few innovations through a tendency to reproduce words of Greek origin by transcription, namely, "energy" for "working," "scandalize" for "offend." There is an occasional preference for words of Latin origin over against Anglo-Saxon, namely, "reside" for "dwell," "interior" for "inward," "plentitude"

for "fullness." On the other hand, Fr. Spencer gives "love" for "charity."

It is in the notes which accompany the text that the peculiar Catholic view of the translator becomes conspicuous. In the notes on Matthew 16. 18, "Thou art Kepha (Rock)" and John 21. 15-17, "Be shepherd over My sheep," Fr. Spencer takes occasion to defend the cardinal Catholic doctrine of the primacy of Saint Peter. But it has to be remembered that the Catholic Church authority requires notes in any Bible published by Catholics. Fortunately, the notes are not an integral part of this version; and those who do not agree with them need not read them.

Fr. Spencer, son of an English clergyman of the Established Church of England who had come to America, was born in New York City, which accounts for the fact that his version is announced as *The First Catholic Translation Made in America*. He became a convert to Catholicism and gave himself to a thorough study of the New Testament instead of doing parochial duties. He spent twenty years in his work of translation, but died before it appeared. Two of his colleagues, alike in scholarship and devotion, have written the introduction and published the book.

It is a masterly work of translation. This can be said without approving all details. It is worthy of a great Church. It is far superior to the Authorized Version, and has a rightful place by the side of the Revised Version and the Moffatt and Goodspeed versions. It deserves to be read in Protestant pulpits; and when so read will break down prejudice and promote Christian union, and prove to be a step toward one English version for all English-speaking peoples.

ISMAR J. PERITZ.

Editor, Journal of
Bible and Religion.

Makers of Christianity. III. From John Cotton to Lyman Abbott. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. New York: Henry Holt & Company. \$2.50.

Men of the Outposts. The Romance of the Modern Christian Movement. By HERBERT WELCH. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

PROFESSOR SWEET is quite at home in the history of Christianity in the United States, and his writings have added substantially to the diffusion of knowledge and appreciation of the subject. A thorough scholar, he is untiring in assembling the facts, and like a good teacher he strives to present his material in interesting form. In this volume, perhaps more successfully than in any of his previous works, he shows his art as a painter of historical portraits. The book is a gallery of miniatures, each typical—the Pioneer, the Founder of Churches, the Revivalist, the Social Reformer, and so forth. But the men, as he delineates them, are living representatives rather than types—if by type one means a lay figure, stiff in form and blank in feature. This is a gallery of human beings. And the figures have their being in their own times and each plays his part on a world-stage set with appropriate period scenery and furniture. And what rugged individuals they are! John Cotton, the First Puritan, and Jonathan Edwards, the first philosophic mind of the New World; William Penn of Penn's Woods, Quaker, and John Carroll, first Catholic hierarch; George Whitefield and Francis Asbury, the wide-ranging Methodists; Gilbert Tennent and Francis Makemie, the Presbyterians, and Roger Williams, the stout Baptist; Charles Grandison Finney and Dwight L. Moody, the soul-winners extraordinary; Walter Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospellers who follow in his

train; Horace Bushnell, the Beechers, Phillips Brooks and Lyman Abbott, sweeteners, broadeners and humanizers of the old harsh doctrines. Each man's significant and distinctive contribution to American Christianity is clearly set forth. Eminently readable, and thoroughly reliable, it is attractive to the general reader, layman or minister, while it is sure to be used as a handy book of reference. One would like to possess an entire encyclopedia of the American pulpit written with equal learning and literary skill.

There is a hint of adventure—even military adventure—in the title of the handsome volume, *Men of the Outposts*, by Bishop Welch, the latest of the notable Drew Biographies, and evidently it is the figure of Christian conquest that is in the author's mind. Frankly it is a book about Christian missions by one who has abundantly demonstrated his right to speak on that subject. As a Methodist bishop who has for sixteen years observed and shared the labors of the men (and women) of the outposts in China, Korea, and Japan, he is familiar with every phase of the problem; has studied methods and personalities, as well as racial and national traits. He can tell why some of the most devoted workers botch the job, while others with apparently second-rate training and equipment make the grade, winning the affection of the people and spending their lives in contented and fruitful labor. From his store of observation and experience he might have written a treatise on missions which would have set down in one-two-three order the basic principles of success and the causes of failure. But in this volume he has done even more. With those principles clearly in mind he has sought out twelve persons—three of them women—through whose life-stories he has skillfully and unobtrusively set before the reader the human illustration

and embodiment of those principles. Here are the Pioneers, Xavier and Livingstone; the Evangelists, Wesley, who failed as a missionary despite his culture and zeal, and William Taylor, who, though far from being an Oxford don, nevertheless "had what it takes"; the Educators, Clark of Massachusetts and Sapporo, and Isabella Thoburn of Ohio and Lal Bagh; the Healers, Dr. Dugald Christie of Mukden and Dr. Albert Schweitzer, of Lambarene; the Social Reformers, Verbeck and Mary Slessor; and that unique pair of leaders and inspirers of the forces both at home and abroad, Clotilda McDowell and John R. Mott. The author's lucid and lively style is perfectly adapted to the biographical method. Each of the chosen twelve stands out as a warm and living person, not a mere mannikin dressed in the writer's opinions. That Bishop Welch has very definite views on missions and missionaries can not be denied. That coming from such an authority they deserve attention is equally true. That this volume, better than most others of recent years, represents the foreign mission enterprise as its most intelligent and best informed friends regard it, is a fact which gives *Men of the Outposts* unusual importance. This is one of the books that Christian young men and women who are now engaged in making their design for living should take into account.

JAMES R. JOY.

New York City.

Thirty Psalmists. By FLEMING JAMES.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
\$2.75.

The Psalms. By MOSES BUTTENWEISER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$5.00.

THESE two volumes are significant of the new interest in the devotional litera-

ture of the Bible. A new approach to this most difficult book of the Old Testament was urgently required and the stimulus to such a movement was given by Hermann Gunkel in his monumental commentary (1926) and the accompanying *Einleitung in die Psalmen* (completed by his pupil Begrich after Gunkel's death). The lines of this new approach had been indicated in numerous earlier articles and smaller volumes; the commentary and introduction set it forth explicitly. It is a new approach in that it studies the literary types or groups (*Gattungen*) in the Psalter, classifying them as Hymns, Laments, Songs of Thanksgiving, Royal Psalms, Wisdom Psalms, Liturgies, and so forth. These forms are found all through the Scriptures and in the Babylonian and Egyptian parallels, and these forms are *fixed and abiding*. These songs were closely associated with the cult and were, to a large extent, fixed rubrics, setting forth the form of words which the priest recited (Psalm 15) or made the worshiper repeat after him (Psalm 116. 13ff.; cp. Deuteronomy 26. 1-7).

This cult relation is emphasized in extreme degree by Mowinckel, and in his *Psalmstudien I-VI* (Kristiania, 1921-24) we have a real apotheosis of the primitive; he pushes Gunkel's principles to an absurd length and caused Gunkel to assert that everything that is logical is not therefore right. Gunkel would leave room for spiritual songs of the individual but Mowinckel will allow nothing unconnected with the cult. Whereas the older method of approach was to infer some historical situation as prompting the Psalm and the older commentators wearied themselves by aid of the exceedingly scanty historical references in the Psalter and oftentimes by the aid of a rather lively imagination to find the exact oc-

casion, the new approach links the Psalm to the religious act of the worshipping community or individual. It finds the "Sitz im Leben" (vital reference) in the cult act. On this method we get an exposition that leaves no residue. Further, this method is more likely to enable us to date particular Psalms, for the origin and development of the literary forms can be traced with a high degree of reliability. Forms that are simple precede more complex and artificial forms; mixed forms do not come early and a dissolving form indicates late date (for example, Psalm 139).

An examination of the first volume here will show the working of the method. The sub-title is "a study in Personalities of the Psalter as seen against the background of Gunkel's Type-Study of the Psalms." Here we have studies of selected Psalms and exposition designed to bring out the personal and spiritual values, the abiding message of these old cult songs, whose *universal value is ensured by their very lack of exact historical reference*. It is an essay in the application of Gunkel's method and is highly satisfactory. Each section is accompanied by a section summarizing the relevant portion of Gunkel's *Einleitung*; an appendix is added on the general subject, "Gunkel's Type-Study of the Psalms," and we can see how it all comes about. Here we have a method that is capable of application throughout, and is applicable to all Scripture that is in poetical form.

It might be too much to say that no satisfactory commentary on the Psalms can be written that fails to take account fully of Gunkel and Mowinckel—to the latter Doctor James does rather less than justice—and that word may be applied to the second volume listed here. Here is a portly tome full of learning and marked

by outstanding linguistic skill, the work of a lifetime. It works, however, on the old method and seeks to find historical events behind the Psalms; "Psalms inspired by the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib," "Psalms of the Year 344 B. C.," "Psalms inspired by the Appearance of Alexander the Great"—such a list of captions will show the method and the largely subjective nature of the judgments. One need only compare the treatment of a Psalm common to both works here, for example, Psalm 122, to see how much larger a horizon and clearer spiritual insight is yielded on the new approach. Buitenweiser is familiar with Gunkel's work though he is, perhaps unconsciously, unjust to him in making him a party to post-exilic date for the Eighty-ninth Psalm; Gunkel in his commentary regards this as a Northern Psalm and dates it in the period of Jeroboam II. He seems only to notice Mowinckel with a footnote and does not list these epoch-making studies in his bibliography. In both volumes the bibliography might be enlarged to advantage.

Both volumes are a credit to the typesetter and the format is pleasing. No student of the Old Testament should fail to see them.

JOHN PATERSON.

Drew University.

In All His Offices. By WILLIAM FRASER McDOWELL. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.00.

"EVERYONE has his favorite sentences. Wise persons have many, so as to meet all necessities and fit all states of mind." This bit of autobiography from the book under review opens an alluring vista into Bishop McDowell's life and work. His preaching illustrated it. Many of his books take their titles from compelling

sentences or phrases: *Good Ministers of Jesus Christ, That I May Save Some, This Mind, Them He Also Called.* And now we have this posthumous volume with the theme "Preach Christ in All His Offices." The Bishop recalls that more than half a century ago this sentence "flashed its light in the face of a young man looking toward a life of preaching and never allowed the light to grow dim." Those who knew him will recall how these words fascinated, haunted and compelled Bishop McDowell in his later years. He eagerly desired to write about them. His conversation, which was always stimulating, turned often in this direction. It must have been a crowning satisfaction in his life to finish the lectures and deliver them before the student body of the Seminary where he himself had graduated fifty-five years before.

This "last will and testament" will be gladly received far beyond the borders of his own church, for William Fraser McDowell was an interdenominational figure. His life story cannot be told without recounting his part in the Federal Council of Churches, his preaching at the great universities, the welcome given him by students at Lake Geneva and other student assemblies, and the famous lecture-ships to which he was called.

In All His Offices is a moving confession of faith in Christ and His gospel. It needs to be read aloud in order that one may catch again the haunting cadences of McDowell's lovely voice. It is a book for the devotional hour for it opens doors into the inner sanctuary of his confidence, love and devotion. His relation to Christ was warm, vital, very personal and therefore strangely kindling as he reveals it in these pages directly or indirectly.

These lectures also show Bishop McDowell's vast respect for the minister's

task concerning which he makes many wise and illuminating observations. "I crave a new start for preaching Christ, a break with the conventional thing that has developed through the centuries and is now treated as though we had reached the final form and the final power. . . . We have only come to the morning of Christ's day. . . . I am yearning for a new ministry, which shall see Christ in His full meaning for the world."

There is nothing of the formal or traditional in Bishop McDowell's treatment. The "offices" discussed in these lectures are those of Son, Prophet, Priest, King, and Interpreter. The reader will be disappointed if he is looking for a theological disquisition. "For a long time now I have used my imagination religiously" on the gospel story, the Bishop truly remarks. That was always one of the secrets of his tremendous preaching power. It is one of the significant values of this book. His concern is not with an authoritative system of theology, but with a Person who can be preached as "an authority in life." It is the Person upon whom his imagination is at work. The results are often positively startling in the richness of his personal assurance and trust.

One is impressed with the contemporary note of this book. The saint so near the end of his earthly journey does not dwell in the past. He speaks not only of "the kind of preacher I have longed to be" but of the preacher "I still long to be before the night falls." "I have watched the dangers attending age, the dangers of becoming reminiscent, possibly pessimistic, and critical: and I am more concerned about the duties of age, the duty of understanding, constructiveness, creativeness, the duty of possessing and showing the fruit of the spirit in accumulation rather than in simple recollection." No

wonder Bishop McDowell was in demand as a preacher even to the very last Sunday of his life. Even his illustrations do not date him in the past. Carlyle, Emerson, and Browning are there, but so too are Masefield and Noyes and modern novelists and playwrights. And always "he quotes like a gentleman," as Bliss Perry said of another.

Bishop McDowell's perennial interest in youth is apparent in this, as in all his previous books. "Youth is an interpreter as well as an interrogation point. He is always in a class by himself. . . . I never look at that Hofmann picture without wondering whether those elders, looking like men I have known, realized at all that they had learned more from the lad than He could have learned from them." McDowell never lost his respect and reverence for youth. This is why youth was ever ready to hear him. President Marsh has given us a vivid picture of the delivery of these lectures: "Each day saw the chapel filled with eager and agile-minded young men, already college graduates, preparing for the gospel ministry. I do not recall that I have ever witnessed anything quite comparable to that week at Boston University."

In this volume, at the end, even as at the beginning, of his long ministry Bishop McDowell is seen bending all his powers to understand Jesus Christ and His meaning for time, and eternity. In one of the many autobiographical passages of the book he tells of a vacation made memorable because during those days of relaxation he read all the major articles relating to Jesus Christ in Hastings's *Dictionary*. It is told as a thrilling adventure. Even from a dictionary "arresting sentences leap out at you from almost every unpromising-looking page." Again, Denney's article on "Preaching Christ" lays powerful hold on Mc-

Dowell's mind and imagination. "The article becomes literature with life in it, and the room becomes a sanctuary again because of His presence there."

Never can the Bishop satisfy himself that he has even measurably described his lifelong search and unending discovery. He passed on into eternal morning still adoring, still pursuing the vision of Christ.

JAMES C. BAKER.

San Francisco, California.

The Validity of the Gospel Record.

By ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.00.

WITH characteristic vigor and ingenuity Professor Scott presents his critique of the form-history approach to the study of the Synoptic Gospels, and seeks to restore confidence in their essential historical trustworthiness—a confidence which in certain respects has been weakened by the researches of K. L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius, R. Bultmann, and others. Recent tendencies, the author urges, seem to have dissolved the gospel history into a mass of unmeaning fragments, the origins of which are sought for in the pious imaginations of second generation Christians, with the result that the Gospels are treated in whole and in part as primary sources for the history of the age in which they were written, and only as secondary sources for the history of Jesus. Doctor Scott will restore their right to be regarded as primary and trustworthy sources for the historic life of Jesus.

Formgeschichte, Professor Scott will show, represents, in most of its emphases, a mistaken approach to gospel study. It has received, he thinks, more attention than it deserves: the evangelists worked with written documents, the nature of

which is not yet fully known; therefore it is premature, on the whole, to study the oral tradition, with which form-history is especially concerned. And in at least four points he challenges the form-critics: (1) He rejects their claim that the gospel material was originally composed of isolated, detached fragments in non-sequential order. The biographical framework, the coherence which the Gospels now possess, he urges, was not imposed upon their material by the evangelists; it was inherent in it. Most of the episodes themselves indicate their place in the history. If, indeed, they were written each on separate cards and the cards then well shuffled, an intelligent man would be able to arrange them in something like the order adopted in our Gospels. (2) The gospel material cannot rightfully be called *Kleinliteratur*, that is, writings of the people, produced by literary amateurs. For the Palestinian Christians were people of no ordinary intelligence, educated people belonging to one of the most highly civilized of ancient peoples, skilled in literary production. The Gospels must therefore be regarded as genuine literature. (3) The gospel material cannot in any sense be regarded as a community product, in which the historic facts of the life of Jesus have been subtly transformed beyond recognition into symbols of the Christian faith, and in which the Christian message is substituted for the historic facts. The religious, ethical, and apologetic aims are not the chief interest of the Gospels: it is historical. The primary concern was with the facts. (4) Since the gospel material is not by and large a community product, the effort to discover its *Sitz im Leben*, the living situation in the Church, in which it is supposed to have originated, is a mistaken one. The material finds its

most natural explanation in the circumstances of Jesus' own life.

Among the arguments which are presented in support of the historic validity of the gospel record, the following may be noted: (1) The Gospels are essentially conservative types of writings. They were intended primarily to preserve the primitive record as it had been transmitted by a succession of teachers. The evangelists were content to act as compilers, for they were chiefly concerned to preserve the tradition. Then, too, the tradition about Jesus developed almost wholly within the Palestinian Church, which was steeped in the Jewish reverence for and habits of tradition. There were here no original minds like Paul or John, who in transmitting the tradition might have transformed it. Furthermore, the Gospels are really official documents, written under the control of the community and for worship purposes; the material was therefore officially protected from change. (2) The chief interest of the Gospels is historical. Other aims were subsidiary to the presentation of the facts. Jesus was always central in His religion, and by nature Christianity involved a knowledge of Him. There never was a time when the Church was neglectful of the life of Jesus and thought only of the message about Him. The history and the message were the same and both were primitive. (3) The one contribution of form-history which Professor Scott thinks really valuable is its study of the "forms" or patterns in which the gospel material is cast. But in contrast to the tendency among form-critics to regard the artificiality of the forms as prejudicial to the historical value of the content, Professor Scott urges that on the contrary the forms are a guarantee of the contents. The Church deliberately transformed the sayings of Jesus into fixed forms in order to

curb the fancy of narrators. Legendary material was thereby for the most part excluded.

These and many other suggestions presented in the book are indeed interesting, but one's evaluation of them will depend upon his method of historical interpretation. It is even difficult to know in just what sense Professor Scott understands his own arguments. For in some moods and on some pages he seems to deny what he has previously affirmed and affirm what he has previously denied. It is difficult to escape the impression that when he

considers the gospel material in the concrete he arrives at much the same conclusions as do the form-critics; it is when he considers the Gospels as a whole and in the abstract that he differs. In any case, the issues which are raised in the book can be settled only by a detailed study of the gospel narratives. The question still remains, *To what extent* is the gospel record historically valid? What is needed is not to plead the case in general but to analyze the documents in detail.

FRED D. GEALY.

Drew University.

Bookish Brevities

Bishop James E. Freeman wrote in *The Cathedral Age* concerning Mr. James Sheldon, the author of the article, "Stained Glass": "His life study of glass, his long residence in Europe, his wide acquaintance with architects, glasspainters, and cities on both sides of the Atlantic, enables him to present his views clearly and convincingly."

At a reception in the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, to the American delegates returning from the Provisional Conference of the World Council of Churches at Utrecht, an ovation was given to William Adams Brown for his unexcelled work. The constitution of the World Council is to be submitted to the churches of the world under the signatures of Doctor Brown and Archbishop Temple.

Schiller said an artist can be recognized by what he leaves out.

In 1937 the Soviet Union imported American books to the value of \$14,752.

In the first four months of 1938, 308 books were published in the United States on Religion and Theology, as compared with 285 in the similar period of 1937. In the twenty-three areas into which book production is divided, fiction was the only one which outnumbered Religion, with Sociology a close third.

In the week after the announcement of the nomination of Dean Thurman Arnold to the office of Assistant Attorney

General of the United States, 1,200 copies of his *The Folklore of Capitalism* were sold.

Edith Wharton, who died last year, was strongly influenced by Henry James. She adopted his conception of a novel, which to be great must first be based upon a profound sense of moral values, and then constructed with a classical unity and economy of means—standards worthy of application to any book.

Scribner's Magazine is responsible for this near profane "Rejection slip":

"Your soul, so kindly submitted for our consideration,
Is here returned to you with deep appreciation,
No criticism of its merit is implied,
But Heaven at present is very well supplied."

William Dean Howells wrote in praise of *The Vicar of Wakefield*: "Kindness and gentleness are never out of fashion. I do not believe that the best art of any kind exists without them. The greatest talent is not that which breathes of the library, but of the street, the field, the open sky, the simple earth."

Dr. W. E. Gilroy, the able editor of *Advance*, tells of receiving many letters of encouragement and appreciation from Doctor Jefferson. Dr. George A. Gordon often telephoned his interest in some article. Frequently Doctor Cadman sent a friendly note of comment about some item in the corner of the paper, where it

would not be expected to attract the eye of as busy a man.

Dr. Alvin Johnson, Chairman of the American Association for Adult Education, cites the results of a six months' study of the patrons of the Public Library of Newark, New Jersey: "Two-sevenths of them read mainly to kill time, more than one-seventh read books dealing with their vocations, one-seventh choose books which discuss some new vocation or avocation, more than one-seventh read in generality with little discrimination of quality, and but one-seventh disclose a serious purpose of cultural improvement."

The New York Times editorially notes that in America, not counting textbooks, we buy about half a book a year per capita. The inference is that there are many millions of us who have not yet discovered what a good thing a good book is; how it shortens the most tedious of journeys; how it consoles the lonely; how it warms the heart when the wind is howling round the corners; how it offers friendships that will not weaken or grow old; how it spans the abysses of time and space; what a beautiful thing it is when well made, how much of the artisan's craftsmanship as well as of the writer's inspiration has gone into it; how it links us with the men and women of old, and makes us familiars of the mighty dead and of the army of good companions who in all generations have walked the dusty highways of the world.

Peter Kjolhede was a prairie minister. In 1881 he received a support of \$713.10. His budget for that year was—House-keeping, \$237.52; Clothing, \$127.02;

Travel, \$72.10; Gifts, \$114.88; Books and Magazines, \$75.27; Savings, \$86.31.

Upon the jacket of his autobiography *The Summing Up*, Somerset Maugham is described as the Dean of living English novelists. When he began, he writes, "my language was commonplace, my vocabulary limited, my grammar shaky, and my phrases hackneyed." He gave himself to long-continued and resolute effort after lucidity, simplicity and euphony. He studied the Song of Solomon as a model for style but found its symbolism too florid to provide expression for his creative impulse. In his master-book *Of Human Bondage* the critics acclaimed him as portraying human passion, aspiration and defeat, without cant or exaggeration. His offensive statements—"the Bible is an Oriental book: its alien imagery has nothing to do with us, those hyperboles and luscious metaphors are foreign to our genius"—betray the superficiality of Maugham's religious understanding, but they reflect the integrity of his mind.

After finishing a series of addresses which are to comprise his next book on *The Gospel and Nervous Breakdown*, Leslie D. Weatherhead collapsed from overwork. He writes, "It seemed inescapable that one's mind should become torn in the conflict between the ideal of all one should be and the physical and mental inability to rise to the demand of all I wanted to do in and for the dear old church." His recovery has been slow and painful, but in a letter to RELIGION IN LIFE, he is sanguine of returning to work in the near future. His *It Happened in Palestine* has been published in Germany.